THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

Statesman Edition

Vol. VI

Charles Sumner

HIS COMPLETE WORKS

With Introduction

BY

HON. GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR

BOSTON

LEE AND SHEPARD

MCM

59358

Copyright, 1872,
by
CHARLES SUMNER.

Copyright, 1900,
by
LEE AND SHEPARD.

Statesman Edition.

Limited to One Thousand Copies.
Of which this is

No. 137

ANNOTATED TO VIVI
HOWARD WRIGHTING

Norwood Press:
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

E
415.6
S95
v. 6

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI.

PAGE

APPEAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES. Letter to the Republican Committee at Boston, June 21, 1856 . . 1

LONGING FOR RESTORATION TO ACTIVE DUTIES, WITH APPEAL TO THE YOUNG MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS. Letter to the Committee of a Young Men's Convention at Fitchburg, August 5, 1856 6

APPEAL TO THE REPUBLICANS OF RHODE ISLAND. Letter to a Committee, September 4, 1856 9

CONTRIBUTION FOR KANSAS. Letter to Messrs. Greeley and McElrath, of the New York Tribune, September 23, 1856, 10

REGRET FOR CONTINUED DISABILITY. Letter to Hon. Lewis D. Campbell, of Ohio, September 24, 1856 . . . 11

EFFECT OF A VOTE FOR BUCHANAN: APPEAL TO THE REPUBLICANS OF ILLINOIS. Letter to a Committee of Republicans at Joliet, October 2, 1856 13

APPEAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN CAUSE. Letter to a Committee of Hudson River Counties, Poughkeepsie, New York, October 3, 1856 15

RELIEF FOR KANSAS. Letter to a Committee of the Kansas Aid Society at Boston, October 3, 1856 18

DUTY TO VOTE FOR KANSAS AND FOR BURLINGAME. Letter to a Meeting at Faneuil Hall, October 29, 1856 . . 20

PUBLIC RECEPTION OF MR. SUMNER, ON HIS RETURN TO BOSTON: WITH THE SPEECHES: November 3, 1856 . . 22

PAGE

AID FOR KANSAS. Letter to Hon. M. F. Conway, November 17, 1856 40

CONGRATULATION ON REËLECTION OF ANSON BURLINGAME AS REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS. Letter to a Banquet at Faneuil Hall, November 24, 1856 41

LATE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OUR BUNKER HILL. Letter to a Committee at Worcester, November 24, 1856 . . 43

LET MASSACHUSETTS HELP KANSAS. Letter to James Redpath, Esq., January 10, 1857 44

ACCEPTANCE OF SENATORSHIP, ON REËLECTION. Letter to the Legislature of Massachusetts, January 22, 1857 . 46

GRATITUDE FOR SYMPATHY OF THE PEOPLE OF VERMONT. Letter to Hon. Ryland Fletcher, Governor of Vermont, March 7, 1857 52

A LAST WORD FOR KANSAS, ON SAILING FOR EUROPE. Letter to James Redpath, Esq., March 7, 1857 . . . 54

INVITATION TO DINNER BY AMERICAN MERCHANTS IN PARIS. Letter to the American Merchants at Paris, April 20, 1857 56

OUR POLITICS SEEN FROM A DISTANCE. Letter to a Friend, dated Heidelberg, September 11, 1857 60

FAREWELL ON SAILING FOR EUROPE A SECOND TIME IN QUEST OF HEALTH. Letter to the People of Massachusetts, on Board Steamer Vanderbilt, New York Harbor, May 22, 1858 62

HONOR TO THE INVENTOR OF THE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH. Letter to Professor Morse, in excusing himself from a Dinner at Paris, August 17, 1858 64

LONGING FOR DUTIES OF POSITION. From a Letter to a Friend, dated at Aix, Savoy, September 11, 1858 . . . 65

INDEPENDENCE AND UNITY OF ITALY. Letter to a Public Meeting at New York, February 17, 1860 . . . 67

PAGE

TWO LESSONS FROM THE LIFE OF WASHINGTON. Letter to the Washington Monument Association of the First School District of Philadelphia, February 21, 1860 . . . 70

MACAULAY ON SLAVERY. Communication to the New York Tribune, March 3, 1860 71

STATUE OF HORACE MANN. Letter to Dr. Samuel G. Howe, March 5, 1860 78

USURPATION OF THE SENATE IN IMPRISONING A CITIZEN. Two Speeches, on the Imprisonment of Thaddeus Hyatt for refusing to testify in the Harper's Ferry Investigation, in the Senate, March 12, and June 15, 1860 . . . 80

ABOLITION OF CUSTOM-HOUSE OATHS. Resolution in the Senate, March 15, 1860 95

BOSTON COMMON, AND ITS EXTENSION. Letter to George H. Snelling, Esq., of Boston, March 26, 1860 . . . 96

ATTEMPT TO KIDNAP A CITIZEN UNDER ORDER OF THE SENATE. The Case of Frank B. Sanborn, of Concord, Massachusetts, with Speeches in the Senate, April 10, 13, and 16, 1860 99

PETITIONS AGAINST SLAVERY. Speech in the Senate, April 18, 1860 106

SAFETY OF PASSENGERS IN STEAMSHIPS FOR CALIFORNIA. Resolution and Remarks in the Senate, May 21, 1860 . 109

CANDIDATES WHO ARE A PLATFORM. Letter to a Ratification Meeting at Buffalo, New York, May 30, 1860 . . 111

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY. Speech in the Senate, on Bill for Admission of Kansas as a Free State, June 4, 1860 . 113

A VICTORY OF PRINCIPLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. Letter to a Public Meeting at Middleborough, Massachusetts, June 11, 1860 287

REFUSAL TO COLORED PERSONS OF RIGHT OF PETITION. Notes of Undelivered Speech in the Senate, on Resolution refusing to receive Petition from Citizens of Massachusetts of African Descent, June 15, 1860 288

PAGE

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN SCHWARTZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA. Speech in the Senate, on Resolutions in Tribute to him, June 21, 1860 300

UNHESITATING ASSERTION OF OUR PRINCIPLES. Letter to the Republicans of New York City, June 27, 1860 . . . 302

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: ITS ORIGIN, NECESSITY, AND PERMANENCE. Speech before the Young Men's Republican Union of New York, at Cooper Institute, July 11, 1860 . 303

OUR CANDIDATES WILL BE ELECTED. Letter to the Lincoln and Hamlin Club of Owego, New York, July 30, 1860 . 342

EMANCIPATION IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES A BLESSING, AND NOT A FAILURE. Letter to a Public Meeting at Framingham, Massachusetts, July 30, 1860 . . . 343

SLAVERY A BARBAROUS DISEASE TO BE STAYED. Letter to a Republican Meeting at the Dedication of the Republican Wigwam in New York, August 6, 1860 . . . 346

TRIBUTE TO A COLLEGE CLASSMATE. Remarks on the Late John W. Browne, August 20, 1860 348

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE ISSUES. Speech at the State Convention of the Republican Party at Worcester, August 29, 1860 352

APPEAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES.

LETTER TO THE REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE AT BOSTON,
JUNE 21, 1856.

APPEAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES.

LETTER TO THE REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE AT BOSTON,
JUNE 21, 1856.

THE selection of a Republican candidate for the Presidency gave rise to the customary discussion in the newspapers, in the course of which the *New York Tribune*, under date of June 6, 1856, expressed itself as follows.

"The People's Convention, which assembles at Philadelphia on the 17th instant, will be called first to decide this question: *Can the opponents of Slavery Extension elect whomsoever they may choose to nominate?* If, on a careful comparison of views, this question can be confidently answered in the affirmative, we have next to consider who, by early, earnest, faithful, protracted, unswerving service to the cause, has done most for the triumph of Humanity and Impartial Freedom; and in that view but three names can be seriously considered, namely, those of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, of New York, SALMON P. CHASE, of Ohio, and CHARLES SUMNER, of Massachusetts. They are all capable, reliable, and deserving, and either of them would worthily fill the highest office in the Republic. We will not weigh their respective claims, but we shall support to the utmost of our ability whichever (if either) of them shall be nominated."

The Republican National Convention assembled at Philadelphia, June 17, 1856, and chose Henry S. Lane, of Indiana, as presiding officer. At an informal ballot for President there were 359 votes for John C. Fremont and 196 for John McLean; New York also gave two votes for Mr. Sumner and one for Mr. Seward. Mr. Fremont was thereupon nominated unanimously. At an informal ballot for Vice-President there were 259 votes for William L. Dayton, 110 for Abraham Lincoln, 46 for N. P. Banks, 43 for David Wilmot, 35 for Charles Sumner, 15 for Jacob Collamer, 9 for John A. King, 8 for S. C. Pomeroy, 7 for Thomas Ford, 5 for Henry Wilson, 4 for Cassius M. Clay, 3 for Henry C. Carey, 2 for J. R. Giddings, 2 for W. F. Johnston, and 1 for A. C. M. Pennington. On a formal ballot, Mr. Dayton was nominated unanimously.

Mr. Sumner, who was at the time a guest of Francis P. Blair, at his place near Washington, addressed the following letter to a meeting at Faneuil Hall, in Boston, for the ratification of the nominations.

SILVER SPRING (near WASHINGTON), June 21, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — I am not strong enough for public speaking, even if I were strong enough for a journey to Boston. Besides, my duties in the Senate have the first claim upon me, and to them I must give my first returning strength. Therefore am I constrained to decline the invitation with which you have honored me.

But I am strong enough to send from my present retreat a brief expression of cordial concurrence in the nominations made by the People's Convention at Philadelphia, and also of the gladness with which I shall support them, by voice and vote, with mind and heart.

I have long honored Colonel Fremont for his genius in geographical enterprise, his eminent intelligence, his manly fortitude, his perfect integrity, and his easy command of men, — swaying to his own beneficent purpose even the savages of the forest, while Nature herself, in her winter fastnesses, bowed before his march. It is well, at this moment, when a Great Crime is instigated and sustained by the National Government, that such a man, with courage which will not be questioned, and with sensitiveness to right which will not rest, should be summoned to grapple with the wrong-doers. And permit me to say that I find no force in the objection that he has never been a *politician*.

Your candidate for Vice-President is worthy to enjoy the same enthusiastic support. As lawyer, as judge, and as Senator, Mr. Dayton has been conspicuous for

character and ability; and I rejoice to believe that he will soon have a larger field of activity, where these can be employed for the good of our common country, while the Senate, which is the stronghold of Human Slavery, will be compelled to receive as its presiding officer a representative of Human Freedom.

But better even than the candidates is the Declaration of Principles, under which we now go forth to conquer. Such a Declaration, promulgated by such a Convention, is in itself the beginning of victory. Strong in simplicity and truthfulness, it must prevail just so soon as it is comprehended. It expresses objects which should enlist the Conservative, while they enlist the Reformer, — which should rally all who turn with respect to the example of the Fathers, while they rally all who are filled with aspirations for a brighter future on earth. It proposes to save Kansas from the revolting usurpation established in that fair Territory, and in this good work it joins issue with the Slave Oligarchy, now swaying our whole country; so that, in saving Kansas, we shall necessarily overthrow this Despotism, and save ourselves. For support, it appeals to all, without distinction of party, who love their country. It appeals to the true Democrat, whose democracy is founded on the recognition of Human Rights; it appeals to the true Whig, who is animated by that hatred of despotic power which inspired those who earliest wore the name; it appeals to the true American, who is ready to forget all other questions for the sake of union to save Liberty endangered; and it appeals to the foreign-born, who, rejoicing in the privileges of American citizens, will not hesitate to join in this holy endeavor to vindicate them against the aggressions of

an Oligarchy worse than any tyranny from which they have fled. In this appeal all former differences are forgotten, while men,

> "Erewhile that stood aloof, as shy to meet,
> Familiar mingle here, like sister streams
> That some rude interposing rock has split."

In this contest there is every motive to union, and also every motive to exertion. *Now or never! now and forever!* — such was the ancient war-cry, which, embroidered on the Irish flag, streamed from the Castle of Dublin, and resounded through the whole island, arousing a generous people to new struggle for ancient rights; and this war-cry may be fitly inscribed on our standard now. *Arise now, or an inexorable slave-driving Tyranny will be fastened upon you. Arise now, and Liberty will be secured forever.*

Present my regards to your associates in the good cause, and believe me, my dear Sir,

Always faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

SETH WEBB, JR., ESQ.

LONGING FOR RESTORATION TO ACTIVE DUTIES,

WITH APPEAL TO THE YOUNG MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS.

LETTER TO THE COMMITTEE OF A YOUNG MEN'S CONVENTION AT FITCHBURG, AUGUST 5, 1856.

CRESSON, ALLEGHANY MOUNTAINS, PA.,
August 5, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — I wish that I could be with the young men of Massachusetts at their proposed Convention, but I am so feeble still that I am constrained to turn away from all temptations and opportunities of labor. In writing this letter I infringe a rule prescribed by my physician.

We have been told that "the duties of life are more than life"; and I assure you that the hardest part of my present lot is the enforced absence from public duties, and especially from that seat where, as a Senator from Massachusetts, it is my right, and also my strong desire at this moment, to be heard. But in the coolness of the mountain retreat where I now am, I begin to gather hope of returning strength, — if too tardily for the performance of any public duties during the session of Congress now about to close, yet in season to take part in the rally of the people for the protection of Liberty in Kansas, and for the overthrow of the oligarchical Tyranny which now degrades our Republic.

Meanwhile I commit the cause which we have at heart to the generous sympathies of the people, who will surely rise to smite the oppressor. Especially do I invoke the young. They are the natural guardians of Liberty. Thus has it been throughout all history; and never before in history did Liberty stand in greater need of their irresistible aid. It is the young who give spontaneous welcome to Truth, when she first appears an unattended stranger. It is the young who open the soul with instinctive hospitality to the noble cause. The young men of Massachusetts act under natural impulses, when they step forward as body-guard of the Republican party.

The great discoverer Harvey, on announcing the circulation of the blood, was astonished to find that no person *upward of forty* received this important truth. The young only embraced it. More fortunate than this discovery, our cause rallies in its support alike the experience of age and the ardor of youth; but it is in the glowing embrace of the young that it finds assurance of victory.

Were I able to make myself heard throughout the land, I would say to the young men everywhere who truly love Liberty: "Your candidate has been the renowned pioneer of civilization in unsettled wastes: associate yourselves with him now as pioneers of Liberty in the National Government; help him unfurl at Washington the flag which he first unfurled on the peaks of the Rocky Mountains; and be copartners with him in the glory of redeeming our beloved country."

Present to the young men of Massachusetts, whom you represent, the assurance of my sincere interest in

their happiness and welfare, and believe me, my dear Sir, with much regard,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

GEORGE H. HOYT, Esq., of the Committee, &c.

APPEAL TO THE REPUBLICANS OF RHODE ISLAND.

LETTER TO A COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 4, 1856.

CRESSON, ALLEGHANY MOUNTAINS, PA.,
September 4, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — Were I well, I should regard your letter as a summons. But I am still in the hands of physicians, by whom I am carefully warned against all public effort. Most reluctantly, at this period of our country's trial, do I submit.

Accept for the Convention which will assemble at Providence my best wishes. Let it apply itself with earnestness, diligence, and singleness of purpose to the rescue of our fair land from the tyranny which now degrades it. Here is room for all, — the aged and the young, the Conservative and the Reformer. Surely, Rhode Island, if not utterly disloyal to herself, if not utterly disloyal to New England civilization, if not utterly disloyal to the Republic of which she constitutes a part, will rise up as one man and insist that Kansas shall be secured to Liberty, and that the Slave Oligarchy shall be driven from its usurped foothold in the National Government. At all events, this State, first planted by the Author of Religious Freedom, will see that Human Rights do not suffer through the votes of her children.

Believe me, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

CONTRIBUTION FOR KANSAS.

LETTER TO MESSRS. GREELEY AND MCELRATH, OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, SEPTEMBER 23, 1856.

MESSRS. GREELEY AND MCELRATH: —

I HAVE watched with interest your generous fund for the relief and liberation of Kansas, now insulted, trodden down, torn, and enslaved by the President of the United States, acting as the tool of the tyrannical Slave Oligarchy. To other funds for this important charity I have already given according to my small means; but, as a constant reader of the "Tribune," I cannot miss the opportunity which you afford to protest anew against an unparalleled Crime, and to contribute anew to its mitigation. Please to accept the check which I enclose for one hundred dollars. I wish it were more, when so much is needed.

Believe me, Gentlemen, your faithful servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

PHILADELPHIA, September 23, 1856.

REGRET FOR CONTINUED DISABILITY.

LETTER TO HON. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL, OF OHIO, SEPTEMBER 24, 1856.

HAMILTON, Monday, September 29, 1856.

EDITORS OF THE CINCINNATI GAZETTE:—

TENS of thousands of the Friends of Freedom were anxious to meet Senator Sumner at this place on Friday last. Many went away disappointed. I had assured the Committee of Arrangements, that, if the state of his health permitted, he would attend the meeting.

I have just received the enclosed private letter, which I venture to hand for publication, that those who were disappointed may understand and appreciate the cause of his non-attendance. It is in answer to a letter in which I urged Mr. Sumner to spend a fortnight in the Miami Valley for recreation, and to appear at the Hamilton meeting, even if his health should not permit him to speak.

Very truly yours, &c.

LEWIS D. CAMPBELL.

PHILADELPHIA, Wednesday, September 24, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — Your letter of the 9th of September, after travelling to Boston, at last found me here, where I am still detained under medical treatment, away from my home, which I have not visited since I left it at the beginning of the late session of Congress, now ten months ago.

With sorrow inexpressible, I am still constrained to all the care and reserve of an invalid. More than four months have passed since you clasped my hand as I lay bleeding at the Senate Chamber, and my system

is even now so far from the firmness of health that any departure from the prescribed rule is sure to occasion a relapse. I could not reach Ohio except by slow stages; and were I there, I should not have the sanction of my physician in exposing myself to the excitements of a public meeting, even if I said nothing. This is hard, very hard, for me to bear; for I long to do something at this critical moment for the cause. What is life without action?

For a while, at least, I must leave to others the precious satisfaction of laboring for Liberty and the redemption of our country. But I have the comfort of knowing that never before was I so little needed.

God bless Ohio for her glorious testimony already, and her more glorious promises!

Believe me, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

HON. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL, Hamilton, Ohio.

EFFECT OF A VOTE FOR BUCHANAN:

APPEAL TO THE REPUBLICANS OF ILLINOIS.

LETTER TO A COMMITTEE OF REPUBLICANS AT JOLIET, OCTOBER 2, 1856.

THE local paper reports that this letter "was received with tremendous applause."

PHILADELPHIA, October 2, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — I am sorry that I cannot be with the Republicans of Illinois at Joliet on the 8th of October, according to the invitation with which they have honored me; but inexorable, long-continued disability and the admonitions of medical skill keep me back still from all public effort, and even from return to my home, which I have not visited for more than ten months.

It is hard to renounce the opportunity which you offer me; for I have constantly hoped to visit Illinois during the present contest, and in plain language put to her people the questions which they are to decide by their votes. These are all involved in the Freedom of Kansas, but they are manifold in form.

Are you *against* the extension of Slavery? If *yea*, then vote for Fremont.

Are you especially *against* the extension of Slavery BY FORCE? If *yea*, then vote for Fremont.

Are you *against* the erection of the Slave Oligarchy as the dominant power in our Republic? If *yea*, then vote for Fremont.

Are you *against* the violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens? If *yea*, then vote for Fremont.

Audacious sophistry, often exposed, but still flaunting abroad, may seek to deceive you. It may foam with abuse and bristle with perversion of fact; but it cannot obscure the unquestionable truth, which now stares everybody in the face, that a vote for Buchanan is a vote for all these bad things. *It is a vote not simply for the extension of Slavery, but also for the extension of Slavery* BY FORCE, involving, besides, the erection of the Slave Oligarchy as the dominant power in our Republic, and the violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens. Surely, Illinois will not be led to sanction such enormities. Hers will be the path of Liberty, which is, of course, the path of true patriotism. Through her agency incalculable harm has already come to the Republic; but I cannot forget that she has begun a glorious reparation, by introducing to the National Councils a Senator of rare skill in debate, of sweetest purity of character, and of perfect loyalty to those principles by which Liberty will be secured, and our good name extended in history. I refer to Mr. Trumbull, who now belongs to the whole country, which is justly grateful for his eminent services. With his example before her, Illinois cannot wander again into the support of Slavery.

Give to the Republicans of Illinois my hearty God-speed, and let my absence speak to them.

Ever faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

To Hon. J. O. Norton.

APPEAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN CAUSE.

LETTER TO A COMMITTEE OF HUDSON RIVER COUNTIES, POUGHKEEPSIE, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 3, 1856.

PHILADELPHIA, October 3, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — Among valued opportunities, which, by the dictation of my physician and the admonitions of continued ill-health, I am constrained to forego, is that afforded by the invitation, with which I have been honored, to meet the Republicans of the Hudson River Counties at Poughkeepsie. They will, I trust, believe me not indifferent to their kindness, or to the cause in whose name they are to assemble.

Nothing but necessity could keep me thus aloof, a mere looker-on, while the great battle of Freedom is waged. The pleasure of the sight to a spectator secure in the distance has been declared by an ancient poet in a much admired passage, reproduced by a greater modern: —

> "'T is pleasant also to behold from far
> The moving legions mingled in the war."

Yet the impulse and ardor of my convictions do not allow me to be content in any such retirement. I wish to enter the strife, and give such powers as I can to the righteous cause. But I am forbidden.

It only remains that from my retreat I should send all that for the present I can give, the prayers and benedictions of one yet too feeble for any exertion.

While thus sitting apart, I am permitted to survey the field and to recognize the ensigns of triumph now streaming in the fresh northern breeze. Everywhere the people are aroused, at least away from the pavement of great cities, where, too often, human perversity is such as to suggest that "God made the country and man made the town."

Iowa, at the extreme West, and Maine, at the extreme East, testify to a sentiment which must prevail also in the intermediate States. In proper season New York and Pennsylvania will confess it. And this is natural; for the whole broad country has been shocked by the enormities of which Mr. Buchanan, in the pending contest, is the unflinching representative, and Mr. Fillmore the cautious, but effective, partisan.

In this contest I discern the masses of the people, under the name of the Republican party, together with good men regardless of ancient party ties, arrayed on the one side, while on the other side is the oligarchical combination of slave-masters, with the few Northern retainers they are yet able to keep, composed chiefly of sophists whose lives are involved in a spider's web of fine-spun excuses, hirelings whose personal convictions are all lost in salary, present or prospective, and trimmers whose eyes fail to discern present changes of opinion only because they are fastened too greedily upon ancient chances of preferment. Such are the parties.

And I discern clearly the precise question on which these parties are divided. In stating it I answer it.

The Territory of Kansas has been made the victim of countless atrocities, in order to force Slavery upon its beautiful, uncontaminated soil. By lawless violence

a Government has been established there, which, after despoiling the citizen of all his dearest rights, has surrounded Slavery with the protection of pretended statutes. And the question is distinctly submitted to the American people, "Are you ready to sanction these enormities?" This is the simple question. The orators of Slavery, freely visiting Poughkeepsie, could not answer it, and therefore they have kept it out of sight. But there the question stands.

Refusing to become partakers of such wrong, you will contribute not only to the freedom of Kansas, but also to the overthrow of the brutal and domineering Oligarchy which seeks to enslave Kansas, simply as a stepping-stone to the enslavement of the whole country. Surely, no man can hesitate, when Freedom requires his vote. Nay, more, is not this cause worth living for? is not this cause worth dying for?

Accept my thanks for the special kindness of your communication, and my regrets that I can answer it only by this imperfect letter.

Believe me, dear Sir, ever faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

STEPHEN BAKER, Esq.

RELIEF FOR KANSAS.

LETTER TO A COMMITTEE OF THE KANSAS AID SOCIETY AT BOSTON, OCTOBER 3, 1856.

PHILADELPHIA, October 3, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — There is inspiration in a good cause, which is shown at once in the improved character of all who embrace it. Especially is this apparent in the young. Never is youth so radiant as under its influence. The young men of Boston have done wisely for themselves in associating together for the relief of Kansas. All that they can do will be twice blessed, — blessing them in their lives, and blessing distant despoiled fellow-citizens.

With pleasure I learn that the Governor will preside at your earliest public meeting. But this is only according to the just rule of life. Kindred to honors are duties; and the head of a Christian Commonwealth should be the head of this Christian charity, while every citizen should range in place, and our beloved Massachusetts, by the contributions, voices, and votes of her unanimous children, should become one united, compact, all-embracing *Kansas Relief Society*, at once an overflowing fountain of beneficence and an irresistible example to the country. For myself, I would rather a thousand times serve this cause, even in the humblest capacity, than be a Governor indifferent to its appeals.

All that can be given is needed; and whoso gives bestows upon a missionary enterprise, which, in the footsteps of Liberty, will carry peace, civilization, Christianity, the Bible, and all blessings of earth and heaven. To such a charity every person must give; if in no other way, the man who has two coats must sell one, and let Kansas have the other. But, while encouraging this effort, candor compels the confession that all your contributions will be of small account, unless a President and Congress are chosen who shall give their sympathies to Freedom rather than to Slavery. Only in this way can the rod of the oppressor be broken. A vote for such men will be a contribution to Kansas.

Present my thanks to your associates, and accept for yourself the assurance of my special gratitude for that constant devotion to human freedom by which you have been distinguished.

Ever faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

DR. W. F. CHANNING.

DUTY TO VOTE FOR KANSAS AND FOR BURLINGAME.

LETTER TO A MEETING AT FANEUIL HALL, OCTOBER 29, 1856.

PHILADELPHIA, October 29, 1856.

SIR, — I cannot be at Faneuil Hall on Saturday evening, according to the invitation with which I have been honored. But, though feeble still, I hope to be in Boston on the succeeding Tuesday, to vote. If not strong enough to speak, I trust at least to be able to perform this duty of the citizen.

My vote will not be needed; but I am unwilling that the opportunity should pass of uttering my determined NO against the efforts now making to subjugate Kansas and to install the Slave Oligarchy in permanent control of the National Government. Against this dreadful conspiracy I protest, with all the ardor of my soul; and I know no way in which I can hope to make this protest immediately effective, except by casting my vote for those candidates openly and unequivocally hostile to the consummation of the crime.

Especially shall I vote for Burlingame; and I shall do this, not only because I think him worthy of honor, and admire his generous nature, intrepidity, and eloquence, but because I have at heart the good name of Boston, and the welfare of my country. Boston should sustain Burlingame, not merely for his sake, but for her

own sake, — not merely to do him honor, but to save herself from dishonor, — not merely from local pride, but to strengthen Liberty and to serve the whole Republic, now endangered alike from criminal audacity and from subservient timidity.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your faithful servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING AT FANEUIL HALL.

PUBLIC RECEPTION OF MR. SUMNER,
ON HIS RETURN TO BOSTON:
WITH THE SPEECHES:

NOVEMBER 3, 1856.

As it became known that Mr. Sumner would return home to vote, a Boston committee visited Philadelphia to urge his acceptance of a banquet, with the understanding that he should simply show himself there without speaking. Acting under medical advice, he declined this invitation. The sympathy of the community found vent in a public reception.

The reception of Senator Sumner, on his return to Boston, was an imposing popular demonstration.[1] It was purely a peaceful and spontaneous celebration. There was no organization of enthusiasm; there were no military, no fire companies, no associated bodies, to swell the ranks of the procession or attract attention. Those of his fellow-citizens, simply, who wished to testify respect and sympathy, went forth to meet him; through the mouth of one, the most venerable and honored of their number, they welcomed him on his entrance within the limits of the city, and the chief executive magistrate of the Commonwealth greeted him on his arrival beneath the shadow of the State capitol. In both places, and also before Mr. Sumner's residence in Hancock Street, there were vast concourses of citizens, assembled to do honor to their Senator.

The weather was favorable; the atmosphere was clear and warm for the season; and although the appearance of the sky at times boded rain, none fell until late in the evening, long after the exercises of the day were concluded.

Mr. Sumner arrived in this vicinity on Sunday morning, November 2d. On Monday he drove from Professor Longfellow's, in Cambridge, where he had been staying, to the house of Amos A. Law-

[1] This account is compiled from the Boston newspapers of the day.

rence, Esq., at Longwood, in Brookline. Soon after one o'clock, the invited guests, who had assembled at the State House, proceeded in open carriages to Longwood, where they were joined by Mr. Sumner, who passed along the line of carriages, and was silently greeted by the gentlemen rising and removing their hats. The carriages then proceeded across to Roxbury, and thence along Washington Street to the Boston line, which was reached at three o'clock. Here the cavalcade was assembled, together with a vast concourse of citizens.

The chief marshal was General John S. Tyler, assisted by the following gentlemen as aids: Major John C. Park, Colonel R. I. Burbank, Major Moses G. Cobb, E. Webster Pike, Esq., Adjutant-General E. W. Stone, Colonel A. J. Wright, Colonel W. W. Bullock, and Carlos Pierce, Esq.

The following were the assistant marshals: Captain I. F. Shepard, Charles H. Hawes, W. E. Webster, F. L. Chapin, O. H. Dutton, Major F. A. Heath, F. B. Fay, Julian O. Mason, A. A. Dunnels, Stephen Rhoades, H. D. Child, Leister M. Clark, Charles W. Pierce, R. F. Martin, Rufus Frost, F. A. Fuller, J. W. Wolcott, William B. Spooner, Henry D. Williams, Colonel Robert Cowdin, of Boston, and Eugene Batchelder, Charles D. Hills, D. P. Ripley, of Cambridge.

As it went up Washington Street, the cavalcade numbered, by actual count, about eight hundred horsemen; but its numbers were subsequently increased by fresh arrivals, in couples and in groups, to over a thousand.

On the head of the cavalcade reaching the borders of Roxbury, it halted, and the whole was drawn up in a long line at the upper side of Washington Street, facing the centre. For over half an hour it waited for the cortege from Brookline which was to escort Mr. Sumner, and when at last the latter appeared, it was received with hearty cheers and music from the Brigade Band. It consisted of some sixteen or eighteen barouches or carriages, containing the Committee of Arrangements and other gentlemen.

The barouche which contained Mr. Sumner was drawn by magnificent horses. With Mr. Sumner was the Rev. Professor F. D. Huntington, of Harvard University, and Dr. Perry, of this city, Mr. Sumner's physician. Among those in the succeeding barouches were Messrs. Abbott and James Lawrence, George and Isaac Livermore, Edwin P. Whipple, George R. Russell, Charles G. Loring, J. Huntington Wolcott, Hon. E. C. Baker, President of the Senate, Dr. Beck and Rev. Dr. Francis, of Cambridge, Professor Lovering, and James Russell Lowell, the poet, — that which followed Mr. Sumner's

barouche containing Professor Longfellow, and George Sumner, the brother of the Senator.

As the carriage with Mr. Sumner touched the line between Roxbury and Boston, there was a general cheer, which was continued along far into the distance, — the Brigade Band playing "Hail Columbia." The first division of the cavalcade wheeled to the left, and formed into an escort. The carriages of Mr. Sumner and the Committee came next in succession, and then the two remaining divisions fell into column.

A few rods north of the Roxbury line the cavalcade came to a halt, when Mr. Sumner's carriage was driven alongside of that containing Hon. Josiah Quincy, and Hon. Alexander H. Rice, mayor of Boston. After greetings between the parties, Professor Huntington introduced Mr. Sumner to Mr. Quincy in the following brief address.

"Mr. Quincy, — The Committee of Arrangements for welcoming the Hon. Charles Sumner to his home present him here to you, Sir, a venerated representative of the city of his birth. He comes back from his public post, where he has bravely advocated the cause of all freemen, to enjoy a freeman's privilege and discharge a freeman's duty. He comes, a cheerful and victorious sufferer, out of great conflicts of humanity with oppression, of ideas with ignorance, of scholarship and refinement with barbarian vulgarity, of intellectual power with desperate and brutal violence, of conscience with selfish expediency, of right with wrong. Boston does well in coming out to greet him. For that ample and lofty manhood, trained under her education and consolidated in her climate, has added new dignity to her old renown. It has joined her name more inseparably than ever with the aspirations of Christian liberty, and the honors of disinterested patriotism, throughout the earth, and through all time."

Mr. Quincy then addressed Mr. Sumner as follows.

"Mr. Sumner, — It is with inexpressible pleasure that I address you this day as the voice of the great multitude of your fellow-citizens. In their name, and by their authority, I welcome you to your home in Massachusetts, expressing their honor and thanks for the power and fidelity with which you have fulfilled your duties as their representative in the Senate of the United States, where, 'unshaken, unseduced, unterrified,' you kept your love, your zeal, your loyalty to Liberty, — where neither number nor example, threat nor sneer, 'within you wrought to swerve from truth, or change your constant mind.' [*Applause.*]

"You return to your country, Sir, after having given glorious evidences of intellectual power, which touched, as with the spear of Ithuriel, the evil spirit of our Union, causing it at once to develop in full proportions its gigantic deformity, compelling it to unveil to the Free States its malign design to make this land of the free a land of slaves. [*Voices, 'Never! never!'*]

"You have suffered, and are still suffering, for your intrepid faithfulness. But suffering in the cause of Truth and Liberty is the heaven-laid path to win 'the crown which Virtue gives after this mortal change to her true servants.' [*Hearty cheers.*]

"I rejoice that my life has been prolonged to this day, — that I am permitted to behold the dawnings of ancient Liberty through the broken openings of the clouds, which for more than fifty years the spirit of Slavery has extended over this Union. I thank Heaven that now, at last, the Free States are beginning to awaken to a sense of their dangers and their duties, — that, at length, they begin to realize that the Slave States have overleaped the bounds of the Constitution. The apathy of half a century may delay for a time the triumphs of Freedom, but come they will. Final success is certain. Never again will the Free States in silence acquiesce in the farther extension of slave domain. [*Loud applause, and cries of 'Never! never!'*] Henceforth they will hear and attend to the warning voice of Washington, solemnly uttered in his Farewell Address, — 'SUBMIT NOT TO USURPATION,' — 'RESIST, WITH CARE, THE SPIRIT OF INNOVATION UPON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTION.' [*Cheers.*]

"We welcome you, Sir, as the champion of Freedom [*loud cheers*], and as one to whom the deliverance which we hope may yet be destined for our country will be greatly due."

MR. SUMNER, who had been standing in his carriage, uncovered, then spoke, in a subdued voice, and evidently under the influence of deep feeling, as follows.

MR. QUINCY, — A year has nearly run since I left Boston in the discharge of public duties. During this period, amidst important events, I have been able to do something which my fellow-citizens and neighbors, speaking by your authoritative voice, are pleased to approve. I am happy in this approbation. Especially am I happy that it is conveyed by the eloquent words of one who from my childhood has been with me an object of unaffected reverence, who was the municipal head of my native city while I was a pupil at its public schools, and who was the head of the University while I was a pupil in that ancient seat.

Boston, early in her history, set her face against Slavery. By a vote, entered upon her Town Records, as long ago as 1701, she called upon her Representatives "to put a period to negroes being slaves." If I have done anything to deserve the greeting you now lavish, it is because I have striven to maintain those principles here declared, and to extend them to other places, — stretching the venerable shelter of Faneuil Hall even over distant Kansas. [*Loud applause.*]

You have made allusion to the suffering which I have undergone. This is not small. But it has been incurred in the performance of duty; and how little is it, Sir, compared with the suffering of fellow-citizens in Kansas! How small is it, compared with that tale of woe which is perpetually coming to us from the house of bondage!

With you I hail the omens of final triumph. I ask no prophet to confirm this assurance. The future is not less secure than the past.

You are pleased to quote injunctions of Washington. If ever there was occasion to bear these, not only in memory, but in heart, the time is now, when Usurpation is the order of the day, and the Constitution is set at defiance. Beyond these precepts is also his great example, which, from first to last, teaches the constant lesson of fidelity, in standing up for the liberties of our country, in undoubting faith that the good cause cannot fail.

The rule of duty is the same for the lowly and the great; and, in the communication which I addressed to the Legislature of Massachusetts, accepting the trust which I now hold, I ventured to adopt the determination of Washington, and to avow his confidence. In both I hope to hold fast unto the end. [*Loud cheers.*]

Mr. Sumner then passed from the carriage in which he had been riding into that of Mr. Quincy and Mayor Rice. Professor Huntington also took a seat in the same carriage, which was drawn by six splendid gray horses. A body-guard of marshals mounted, and of police, formed on each side of the barouche, in order to keep the multitudes in the streets from pressing up to shake hands with Mr. Sumner.

The cavalcade then proceeded onwards, amid repeated cheers of the multitudes lining the streets on both sides. In accordance with directions from his physician, Mr. Sumner acknowledged these demonstrations only by a wave of the hand.

On reaching Newton Street, on Blackstone Square, a long line of beautiful young ladies was ranged upon the pavement on the south side, each holding a bouquet, to present to Senator Sumner. Previously, however, a very interesting scene took place. Mrs. C. W. Pierce, Mrs. G. L. Goodwin, Mrs. Henry Keyes, and Miss Mary Pierce — each dressed in white, with wreaths on their heads, and wearing elegant sashes — came forward, and presented Mr. Sumner splendid bouquets, which action seemed to give him much gratification. But the receipt of another from the hands of a lovely child, carried up to the Senator in the arms of a gentleman, and a similar act in Shawmut Avenue, were peculiarly grateful to him. No previous or subsequent circumstances during the day seemed to give Mr. Sumner such true delight as these kindnesses. On proceeding forward, the ladies showered their bouquets upon him from sidewalks and windows along the street, until the carriage was pretty nigh full. As the floral burden accumulated, he laughed the more heartily, and spoke his gratitude to every one of the fair donors his voice could reach. All along Newton Street, and the west side of Blackstone Square, the procession was cheered in the most enthusiastic manner. Ladies crowded almost every window, and the scene was the most brilliant along the route.

As the procession reached the Boston Female Orphan Asylum on Washington Street, the inmates of that institution were seen ranged in front of the building, waving their handkerchiefs, and displaying on a white banner a beautiful wreath of evergreen intermingled with flowers, with the motto, —

"We weave a wreath for Charles Sumner."

This was the only point on the route of the procession where Mr. Sumner rose to his feet. Here the kindness of these orphaned ones so touched his feelings, that he could not help acknowledging it in this way.

Attached to several of the bouquets thrown to Mr. Sumner were appropriate and expressive mottoes. The principal of them were as follows.

"No bludgeon can dim the lustre of our champion of Freedom."

"Massachusetts's most honored son. If the ladies could vote, he would be the next President."

"A warm welcome from warm hearts to the noblest man America has ever borne in her bosom! 78 Shawmut Avenue, Nov. 3, 1856."

"Welcome home! The sons and daughters of Massachusetts greet her noblest defender."

"Infants welcome him whose name lives immortal in the hearts of his countrymen."

"Welcome, dear friend of justice!"

All along the line of procession, namely, down Washington Street, Newton Street, Shawmut Avenue, Dover Street, Washington Street, West Street, Tremont Street, Boylston Street, Charles Street, and Beacon Street to the State House, the crowds which greeted the honored Senator at every point were great.

At the corner of Washington and Newton Streets, over Washington, there was a fine display of flags and streamers. From the house of Mr. Nickerson, fronting on Franklin Square, was a splendid triumphal arch, between two elm-trees, flags and streamers surrounding the word —

"Welcome!"

Newton Street had a large number of flags, the union jack displayed alternately with the national ensign on staffs projecting from Franklin Square. The entire street was strewed with evergreens. It was a beautiful display.

At the junction of Newton Street and Shawmut Avenue, the houses of Benjamin Smith and Alfred A. Andrews were splendidly decorated with festoons and flags. Between them, floating above Newton Street, was the following: —

"Massachusetts loves, honors, will sustain and defend her noble Sumner!"

The house of E. G. Dudley, at the corner of Shawmut Avenue and Waltham Street, made a fine appearance. Besides flags and festoons, was the following, wreathed in black: —

"May 22, 1856."

Beneath this was the following: —

"Welcome, thrice welcome!"

At the corner of Shawmut Avenue and Dover Street, on the house of Rev. Mr. Sargent, was the following significant motto: —

"To the *Right!*"

pointing the route of the procession.

The house of Dr. Parks, No. 88 Dover Street, was beautifully decorated, — an eagle above the upper-story windows, holding a number of streamers, which were gathered below. The following was inscribed upon the building: —

"Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

The piano-rooms of T. Gilbert were decorated, with the words in front, —

"Welcome, Freedom's Defender!"

There were many other similar decorations. If longer time had been given, the demonstration would have been other than it was.[1] But it was not in decorations that the citizens of Boston welcomed home the beloved son of Massachusetts; it was rather with emotion too deep for utterance that they received him.

The scene at the State House was beyond description. The area in front, the long range of steps leading to the Capitol, the Capitol itself, the streets in the vicinity, the houses even to the roofs, were packed with human beings. The assembled thousands greeted him with long continued cheering.

Mr. Sumner arrived in front of the Capitol, where a platform had been erected. His Excellency Governor Gardner, the Executive Council, and the Governor's Staff were escorted by the Sergeant-at-Arms, Benjamin Stevens, Esq. Mr. Sumner was then introduced by Professor Huntington in an eloquent speech, as follows.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY, — In behalf of the Committee of Reception, I present to your Excellency the Hon. Charles Sumner, Senator

[1] On the balcony of his house in Beacon Street, as the procession passed, was William H. Prescott, the historian, with his family, waving their handkerchiefs. The next day Mr. Prescott called on Mr. Sumner, and said, that, had he known there would have been decorations and inscriptions on houses, he should have placed on his these words: —

"May 22, 1856.

"Then I, and you, and all of us fell down,
Whilst bloody Treason flourished over us."

of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States. It is needless to recount here his services to our Commonwealth, to the whole Republic, to the principles of a pure and just nationality, to elegant learning, to Christian statesmanship, to the liberties and the rights of man. These are all safely recorded in the imperishable history of the country and the race. How deeply they are written in the hearts of his fellow-citizens let this vast and enthusiastic concourse bear witness. He returns to his friends; but his friends are wherever justice is revered. He returns to his neighbors; but he has a neighbor in every victim of wrong throughout the world. He returns to the State that entrusted her interests to his charge, having proclaimed — according to the spirit of her own institutions and her people — the doctrine of the Brotherhood of all States, in the bonds of universal Peace. He stands at the door of her Capitol, and in the presence of her Chief Magistrate, — stands here her faithful steward, her eloquent and fearless advocate, her honored guest, her beloved son!"

His Excellency replied briefly as follows.

"Sir, — I am admonished by the Committee of Arrangements that my words must be few and brief.

"This is no political ovation. The Chief Marshal of the procession announces that no political mottoes will be admitted into the ranks. By the same sense of propriety I am admonished that no political phrases are appropriate here.

"This is the spontaneous outpouring of your friends and neighbors and fellow-citizens to welcome you from your field of intellectual victory, — and to welcome you also from your bed of pain and suffering. I cordially add my tribute, humble, save what my official station imparts to it, to crown the just and welcome offering.

"We hail you with warm hearts, not only as the eloquent orator, the accomplished scholar, and the acknowledged statesman, — not only as the earnest friend of suffering humanity and of every good cause, — not only as one who, educated in the institutions and by the altars and firesides of Massachusetts, has won for himself imperishable laurels on the arena of the nation's conflicts, — but especially now do we welcome you as the successful defender of her integrity and her honor. [*Cheers.*]

"In her name I declare that the base and cowardly blows which fell on you struck through you into her. Within the circuit of the sun's flight after I heard of that assault, before such an assemblage as rarely gathers in Faneuil Hall, I pledged Massachusetts to stand by you. [*Loud applause.*]

"And she does stand by you to-day. She will stand by you to-morrow [*enthusiastic cheers*]; and she will stand by you in her defence forever. [*Loud cheering.*]

"I welcome you, then, most cordially and warmly, in her name, again to her borders. Every thrilling breast and kindling countenance around you in this immense throng welcomes you, — Boston welcomes you, — Massachusetts welcomes you.

"In her name I trust that the quiet of your home may speedily restore you to perfect health, so you can again go forward to your sphere of duty, to new achievements, and new victories.

"And now, Gentlemen, fellow-citizens, one word to you. The duty of the day over, let us, one and all, leave our distinguished friend to the undisturbed quiet of his own home, to the fond caress of one whose ear is at this moment bent in anxious watching for the earliest warning of his approach, that he may there recover, not only from his past illness, but from the present excitement and the fatigues of travel. At present our kindest attentions will consist in scrupulously avoiding exacting intrusions.

"To you, Sir, again, in the name of our glorious old Commonwealth, I extend a cordial welcome. [*Loud cheers.*]"

Three times three cheers were then given for Mr. Sumner, who attempted to reply; but his voice was more feeble than in replying to Mr. Quincy. He spoke, with great difficulty, as follows.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY, —

IT is a pleasure to be once more among the scenes of home; to look upon familiar objects, — the State House, the Common, and well-known streets. It is more pleasant still to behold the countenances of friends. And all this pleasure, Sir, is enhanced by the welcome which you now give me, in behalf of the beloved Commonwealth which for five years I have served, honestly, earnestly, and constantly, in an important field of duty, to which I was introduced by an unsought suffrage.

Sir, I thank you for this welcome. I thank, also, the distinguished gentlemen who have honored this occasion by their presence. I thank, too, these swelling multitudes who contribute to me the strength and succor of their sympathies; and my soul overflows especially to the young men of Boston, out of whose hearts, as from an exuberant fountain, this broad-spreading hospitality took its rise.

My earnest desire, often expressed, has been, that I might be allowed to return home quietly, without show or demonstration of any kind. And this longing was enforced by my physical condition, which, though vastly improved at this time, and advancing surely towards complete health, is still exposed to the peril of relapse, or at least to the arrest of those kindly processes of Nature essential to the restoration of a shattered system. But the spontaneous kindness of this reception makes me forget my weakness, makes me forget my desire for repose.

I thank you, Sir, for the suggestion of seclusion, and the security which that suggestion promises to afford.

Something more, Sir, I would say, but I am admonished that voice and strength will not permit. With your permission, therefore, I will hand the reporters what I should be glad to say, that it may be printed.

[The remainder of the speech is printed from Mr. Sumner's manuscript.]

More than five months have passed since I was disabled from the performance of my public duties. During this weary period I have been constrained to repeat daily the lesson of renunciation, — confined at first to my bed, and then only slowly regaining the power even to walk. But, beyond the constant, irrepressible grief which must well up in the breast of every patriot, as he discerns the present condition of his country, my chief sorrow has been caused by the necessity, to which I was doomed, of renouncing all part in the contest for human rights, which, beginning in Congress, has since enveloped the whole land. The Grecian chief, grievously ill of a wound from the

stealthy bite of a snake, and left behind while his companions sailed to the siege of Troy, did not repine more at his enforced seclusion. From day to day and week to week I vainly sought that health which we value most when lost, and which perpetually eluded my pursuit. For health I strove, for health I prayed. With uncertain steps I sought it at the seashore and I sought it on the mountain-top.

> "Two voices are there: one is of the sea,
> One of the mountains; each a mighty voice:
> In both from age to age thou didst rejoice,
> They were thy chosen music, Liberty!"[1]

I listened to the admonitions of medical skill, and I courted all the bracing influences of Nature, while time passed without the accustomed healing on its wings. I had confidently hoped to be restored so as to take my seat in the Senate, and to be heard there again, long before the session closed. But Congress adjourned, leaving me still an invalid. My next hope was, that I might be permitted to appear before the people during the present canvass, and with heart and voice plead the great cause now in issue. Here again I have been disappointed, and the thread of my disability is not yet spun to the end. Even now, though happily lifted from long prostration, and beginning to assume many of the conditions of health, I am constrained to confess that I am an invalid, — cheered, however, by the assurance that I shall soon be permitted, with unimpaired vigor, to resume all the responsibilities of my position.

Too much have I said about myself; but you will pardon it to the occasion, which, being personal in

[1] Wordsworth, Thought of a Briton on the Subjugation of Switzerland.

character, invites these personal confessions. With more pleasure I turn to other things.

I should feel that I failed in one of those duties which the heart prompts and the judgment confirms, if I allowed this first opportunity to pass without sincerest acknowledgment to my able, generous, and faithful colleague, Mr. Wilson. Together we labored in mutual trust, honorably leaning upon each other. By my disability he was left sole representative of Massachusetts on the floor of the Senate, throughout months of heated contest, involving her good name and most cherished sentiments. All who watched the currents of debate, even as imperfectly as I did in my retirement, know with what readiness, courage, and power he acted, — showing himself, by extraordinary energies, equal to the extraordinary occasion. But it is my especial happiness to recognize his unfailing sympathies for myself, and his manly assumption of all the responsibilities of the hour.

I am not here to indulge in eulogy, nor to open any merit-roll of service; but the same feeling which prompts these acknowledgments to my colleague embraces also the Commonwealth from whom we have received our trust. To Massachusetts, mother of us all, — great in resources, great in children, — I now pledge anew my devotion. Never before did she inspire equal pride and affection; for never before was she so completely possessed by those sentiments which, when manifest in Commonwealth or citizen, invest the character with its highest charm, so that what is sown a natural body is raised a spiritual body. My filial love does not claim too much, when it exhibits her

as approaching the pattern of a Christian Commonwealth, which, according to the great English Republican, John Milton, "ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body."[1] Not through any worldly triumphs, not through the vaults of State Street, the spindles of Lowell, or even the learned endowments of Cambridge, is Massachusetts thus, — but because, seeking to extend everywhere within the sphere of her influence the benign civilization which she cultivates at home, she stands forth the faithful, unseduced supporter of Human Nature. Wealth has its splendor, and the intellect has its glory; but there is a grandeur in such service which is above all that these can supply. For this she has already the regard of good men, and will have the immortal life of history. For this she has also the reproach and contumely always throughout the ages poured upon those who have striven for justice on earth. Not now for the first time in human struggles has Truth, when most dishonored, seemed most radiant, gathering glory even out of obloquy. When Sir Harry Vane, courageous champion of the English Commonwealth, was dragged on a hurdle up the Tower Hill to suffer death by the axe, one of the multitude cried out to him, "That is the most glorious seat you ever sat on!"[2] And again, when Russell was exposed in the streets, on his way to a similar scaffold, the people, according to the simple narrative of his biographer, imagined they saw Liberty and Virtue sitting by his side. Massachusetts is not without encouragement

[1] Of Reformation in England, Book II.: Prose Works, ed. Symmons, Vol. I. p. 29.

[2] Howell's State Trials, VI. 192.

in her own history. She has seen her ports closed by arbitrary power, — has seen her name made a byword of reproach, — has seen her cherished leaders, Hancock and Adams, excepted from all pardon by the crown; but then, when most dishonored, did Massachusetts deserve most, for then was she doing most for the cause of all. And now, when Massachusetts is engaged in a greater cause than that of our fathers, how serenely can she turn from the scoff and jeer of heartless men! Her only disgrace will be in disloyalty to the truth which is to make her free.

Worse to bear — oh, far worse! — than the evil speaking of others is the conduct of some of her own children. It is hard to see the scholarship which has been drawn from her cisterns, and the riches accumulated under her hospitable shelter, now employed to weaken and discredit that cause which is above riches or scholarship. It is hard, while fellow-citizens in Kansas plead for deliverance from a cruel Usurpation, and while the whole country, including our own soil, is trodden down by a domineering and brutal Despotism, to behold sons of Massachusetts in sympathy, open or disguised, with the vulgar enemy, quickening everywhere the lash of the taskmaster, and helping forward the Satanic carnival, when Slavery shall be fastened not only upon prostrate Kansas, but upon all the Territories of the Republic, — when Cuba shall be torn from a friendly power by dishonest force, — and when the slave-trade itself, with all its crime, its woe, and its shame, shall be opened anew under the American flag. Alas, that any child of Massachusetts, in wickedness of heart, or in weakness of principle, or under the delusion of partisan prejudice, should join in these things! With such I

have no word of controversy at this hour. But, leaving them now, in my weakness, I trust not to seem too severe, if I covet for the occasion something of the divine power

> "To bend the silver bow with tender skill,
> While, void of pain, the silent arrows kill."[1]

Gladly from these do I turn to another character, yet happily spared to Massachusetts, whose heart beats strong with the best blood of the Revolution, and with the best sentiments by which that blood was enriched. The only child of one of the authors of American Liberty, for many years the able and courageous Representative of Boston on the floor of Congress, where his speeches were the masterpieces of the time, distinguished throughout a long career by the grateful trust of his fellow-citizens, happy in all the possessions of a well-spent life, and surrounded by "honor, love, obedience, troops of friends," with an old age which is second youth, JOSIAH QUINCY, still erect under the burden of eighty-four winters, puts himself at the head of our great battle, — and never before, in the ardor of youth, or the maturity of manhood, did he show himself so grandly conspicuous, and add so much to the heroic wealth of our history. His undaunted soul, lifted already to glimpses of another life, may shame the feebler spirits of a later generation. There is one other personage, at a distant period, who, with precisely the same burden of winters, asserted the same supremacy of powers. It is the celebrated Dandolo, Doge of Venice, at the age of eighty-four, of whom the historian Gibbon has said, in words strictly applicable to our own Quincy: "He shone, in the last period of human

[1] Odyssey, tr. Pope, Book XV. 410, 411 [450, 451].

life, as one of the most illustrious characters of the times: under the weight of years he retained a sound understanding and a manly courage, the spirit of an hero and the wisdom of a patriot."[1] This old man carried the Venetian Republic over to the Crusaders, and exposed his person freely to all the perils of war, so that the historian describes him, in words again applicable to our day, saying: "In the midst of the conflict, the Doge, a venerable and conspicuous form, stood aloft, in complete armor, on the prow of his galley," while "the great standard of St. Mark was displayed before him."[2] Before the form of our venerable head is displayed the standard of a greater republic than Venice, thrilling with its sight greater multitudes than ever gazed on the standard of St. Mark, while a sublimer cause is ours than the cause of the Crusaders; for our task is not to ransom an empty sepulchre, but to rescue the Saviour himself, in the bodies of his innumerable children, — not to dislodge the Infidel from a distant foreign soil, but to displace him from the very Jerusalem of our liberties.

May it please your Excellency, I forbear to proceed further. With thanks for this welcome, accept also my new vows of duty. In all simplicity let me say that I seek nothing but the triumph of Truth. To this I offer my best efforts, careless of office or honor. Show me that I am wrong, and I stop at once; but in the complete conviction of right I shall persevere against all temptations, against all odds, against all perils, against all threats, — knowing well, that, what-

[1] Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Chap. 60.
[2] Ibid.

ever may be my fate, the Right will surely prevail. Terrestrial place is determined by celestial observation. Only by watching the stars can the mariner safely pursue his course; and it is only by obeying those lofty principles which are above men and human passion that we can make our way safely through the duties of life. In such obedience I hope to live, while, as a servant of Massachusetts, I avoid no labor, shrink from no exposure, and complain of no hardship.

The cavalcade then moved rapidly away, escorting Mr. Sumner to his home in Hancock Street.

On arriving there, he was again welcomed with unbounded enthusiasm by a large crowd assembled in the street and on the sidewalks, the windows being filled on both sides up and down the street. The crowd cheered vociferously for Mr. Sumner, his mother, the Governor, Hon. Josiah Quincy, Hon. N. P. Banks, and Hon. Anson Burlingame. Mr. Sumner and his mother appeared at the window and bowed their acknowledgments, which called forth general and enthusiastic plaudits. The multitude then, giving three parting cheers for the distinguished Senator, separated, and the ceremonies of reception terminated.

Many of the business firms closed their stores during the afternoon. The paper agreeing to do so was headed by A. & A. Lawrence & Co., Gardner Brewer & Co., Parker, Wilder, & Co., Denny, Rice, & Gardner, Wilkinson, Stetson, & Co., Blake, Bigelow, & Co., Pierce Brothers & Flanders, &c.

AID FOR KANSAS.

LETTER TO HON. M. F. CONWAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1856.

HON. M. F. CONWAY, afterwards Representative in Congress from Kansas, in communicating this letter to the public, reported that it "was of great value in securing the appropriation of twenty thousand dollars by the Legislature of Vermont in aid of Kansas."

BOSTON, November 17, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — I wish that I could aid your efforts to interest the State Legislatures for Kansas. To these Legislatures I look at this exigency for something worthy of the cause which is now in jeopardy. They have the power, and this is the very moment to exert it. God bless the State which begins!

Surely liberty in Kansas, involving our own liberty also, is worthy of every effort. To its security every citizen should contribute according to his means; and I know no better rule for the State Legislatures than for the citizen. These Legislatures should all contribute according to their means, — the more, the better. And such contributions, like every other charity, will be twice blessed.

Accept my best wishes for Kansas, and believe me, dear Sir.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

JUDGE CONWAY, of Kansas.

CONGRATULATION ON REËLECTION OF ANSON BURLINGAME AS REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS.

LETTER TO A BANQUET AT FANEUIL HALL, NOVEMBER 24, 1856.

HANCOCK STREET,
Monday Evening, November 24, 1856.

DEAR SIR, — I am sorry to renounce any opportunity of doing honor to Mr. Burlingame; but my careful physician does not allow me yet to take part in the excitement of a public meeting, and I yield to his prescription.

My best wishes attend your distinguished guest to-night and always. His recent triumph is the occasion of special joy, not only in Massachusetts, but everywhere throughout the free North. Many who voted against him must, in their better moments, condemn themselves, — as much as they have been condemned by others. If not entirely dead to generous impulses, they must be glad that they failed. If not entirely insensible to appearances, they must look with regret at the means employed to accomplish the end proposed. If not entirely indifferent to principles, they must look with amazement at the unprecedented, incongruous, and eccentric political conglomerate of which they constituted a part.

It was natural that the propagandists of Slavery, acting under dictation from Washington, should vote against Mr. Burlingame. It was natural that others,

who allow themselves to be controlled by the rancors and jealousies of party, should do likewise. But it was hard that this blow at Freedom should be attempted in the name of Trade, and that merchants of Boston should be rallied against a candidate who had done so much to make Boston respectable. And yet this extraordinary conduct is not without parallel in history. The earliest antislavery effort of England was against the Barbary corsairs, and this, it is well known, was opposed by "the mercantile interest." And this same "mercantile interest," as you also know, set itself against the great antislavery enterprise of Clarkson and Wilberforce, when they demanded the suppression of the slave-trade. Such examples teach us not to be disappointed, when this interest is invoked against our efforts. But I rejoice to know that in Boston there are honorable exceptions, and, if anything be expected from me to-night, let it be a tribute to one of these. I propose the following toast.

The Merchants of Boston. — May they all appreciate the spirit of him among their number, who, when pressed to vote against Mr. Burlingame on mercantile grounds, nobly replied at once, "I am a merchant, but at the polls I mean to be a patriot."

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

JOSEPH STORY, Esq.

THE LATE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OUR BUNKER HILL.

LETTER TO A COMMITTEE AT WORCESTER, NOVEMBER 24, 1856.

BOSTON, November 24, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — Not willingly do I give up the opportunity of uniting with the gallant Republicans of Worcester in celebrating our recent victories; but my health, though vastly improved, has limitations which I cannot with prudence neglect, and these forbid the indulgence to which you kindly invite me. Please tender to the Republicans my cordial congratulations. Clearly do I see the beginning of the end. All New England, with New York, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa, constitute an irresistible phalanx for Freedom, while our seeming reverse in the Presidential election is only another Bunker Hill. If toasts are in order at your festival, let me propose the following.

The late Presidential Election. — Like Bunker Hill, it teaches us our strength, and gives assurance of speedy triumph.

Believe me, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

LET MASSACHUSETTS HELP KANSAS.

LETTER TO JAMES REDPATH, ESQ., JANUARY 10, 1857.

HANCOCK STREET, January 10, 1857.

MY DEAR SIR, — I am happy that you are still active for Kansas. Much remains to be done. Indeed, I think that no effort can be safely relaxed, until the Territory is admitted into the Union as a Free State.

The Slave Oligarchy has not yet abandoned its darling idea of a new Slave State, and this can be defeated only by vigilance. The lull which seems now to prevail does not persuade me to repose. Too much is at stake. Besides, I have read the fable of the cat in the meal.

Of course, emigrants who love Freedom, and, if need be, are willing to die in her cause, must be encouraged to plant themselves in the Territory. But we who stay at home must contribute to their comfort and protection, and, since this can be done most effectively through State Legislatures, these must be enlisted. The name of a State Legislature will be a tower of strength.

Massachusetts, which, throughout our history, has led in every liberal movement, must lead now by a generous appropriation, which, if not needed, may not be used, but which, in any alternative, will be an irresistible token of her sincerity, an example to other

States, and a fountain of encouragement to distant fellow-citizens. I cannot believe that Massachusetts will hesitate. Her people have already opened their hearts to Kansas, and the public treasury should be opened as wide as their hearts.

Accept my thanks for the good you have done and the good you are still doing, and believe me, my dear Sir, with much regard,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

JAMES REDPATH, Esq.

ACCEPTANCE OF SENATORSHIP, ON REËLECTION.

LETTER TO THE LEGISLATURE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
JANUARY 22, 1857.

IN the winter of 1856, the American party having the control of the Legislature of Massachusetts, members of this party were reported as entering into a plan to choose a Senator in place of Mr. Sumner at the expiration of his term, March 4, 1857, thus anticipating the action of the Legislature to be chosen in the autumn following. The plan was discussed in newspapers and in contemporary letters. It excited the anxiety of Mr. Sumner's political friends so far, that, at their request, he was induced to obtain from the Secretary of the Senate the adverse precedents, which were published at the time in the newspapers. The discussion of the question was arrested by the event which soon followed, turning all eyes to him, and making him more than ever the representative of Massachusetts.

The new Legislature seemed to have been constituted for the reëlection of Mr. Sumner. It came together January 7, 1857, when, even before the message of the Governor, it was insisted that the election should be proceeded with, and January 9th was fixed upon for this purpose. On that day, in pursuance of an order of the House, the Clerk called the roll of members, when each responded *viva voce* with the name of the person for whom he voted, as follows.

Charles Sumner, of Boston,	333
Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston,	3
Nathaniel J. Lord, of Salem,	2
George W. Gordon, of Boston,	1
Erasmus D. Beach, of Springfield,	1
Charles B. Goodrich, of Boston,	1
Otis P. Lord, of Salem,	1
Edward Everett, of Boston,	1
William Appleton, of Boston,	1
Rufus Choate, of Boston,	1
Total vote,	345
Members absent or not voting,	10
Whole number of members,	355

The announcement of the vote was received with applause.

In the Senate the vote was taken in the same way, January 13th, and every member responded with the name of "Charles Sumner, of Boston," the vote being unanimous, when the President announced that "Hon. Charles Sumner, of Boston, having received the entire vote of the Senate, in concurrence with the House, is elected United States Senator from this State for the term of six years from the fourth of March next."

The *Boston Daily Advertiser* noticed this event as follows.

"It is impossible to refrain from comparing the election of yesterday with Mr. Sumner's previous election in the same place six years ago. *Now* he receives nearly all the votes, on the first ballot, taken on the third day of the session, every member speaking aloud his vote. *Then* he received only the exact number necessary for a choice, — one more than half the whole number; and the election was not effected until the twenty-sixth ballot, taken on the one hundred and fourteenth day of the session (April 24, 1851), and the votes were thrown in sealed envelopes. *Then* he was the candidate of a party which threw 27,636 votes in the State, at the preceding popular election, or about one fifth of the whole number. *Now* he is the candidate of a party which threw 108,190 votes in the State, at the last popular election, or about two thirds of the whole number. *Then* he was chosen to a body where he could expect to find but two or three associates sympathizing with his sentiments. *Now* he is a member of a party which has a majority in the lower House of Congress, and numbers a quarter of the members even of the Senate of the United States. Truly, *tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis.*"

The *New York Tribune* had the following comment.

"We need not; in view of recent events, point out the change which has taken place in the public sentiment of Massachusetts. It is not too much to say that Mr. Sumner is at this moment the most popular man in the State, the opinions of which he so truly represents. Nor will it do to attribute this general love, honor, and sympathy entirely to the felonious assault made upon Mr. Sumner. Had he been less true to the cause committed to his keeping, had he trimmed and temporized, and spoken softly when he should have spoken sharply, he would have been safe from the bludgeon of the bully, and might have won the smiles instead of the expectorations of a certain servile Senator. The people of Massachusetts have estimated Mr. Sumner's service in all its length and breadth; they have duly weighed all its incidents and indignities, — what he has suffered, what he has accomplished, and what he has failed to accomplish; and their verdict, expressed in yesterday's almost unanimous vote in the House of Representatives, bestows upon him a crown of honor which may well assuage the hope deferred of a tardy convalescence. Few public men have had such large opportunities, few public men have so nobly improved them."

On the 23d of January, 1857, Hon. Charles A. Phelps, Speaker of the House of Representatives, laid before the House the following letter, which was read, and, on motion of Hon. Charles Hale, of Boston, entered at large upon the Journal.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, —

I HAVE been officially notified that the people of Massachusetts, by concurrent votes of both branches of the Legislature, have charged me with the duty of representing them in the Senate of the United States for another term of six years, on the expiration of that which I now have the honor to hold. This renewed trust I accept with gratitude enhanced by the peculiar circumstances under which it is bestowed. But far beyond every personal gratification is the delight of knowing, by this sign, that the people of Massachusetts, forgetting ancient party hates, have at last come together in fraternal support of a sacred cause, compared with which the fate of any public servant is of small account.

When first selected for this eminent trust, I was a stranger to all official life. Untried in public affairs, I was taken up, and placed, without effort of my own, and even without antecedent aspiration, in the station where, after an experience of nearly six years, you now, with spontaneous unanimity, bid me remain. About to commence a fresh term of service, I turn with honest pride to that which is about to close, while I greet anew the duties and responsibilities of my position, — hoping, that, by conscientious endeavor, I may do something in the future better than in the past, and mindful that "he that girdeth on his harness should not boast himself as he that putteth it off."

The duties of a public servant are not always conspicuous. Much of his time is absorbed in cares which, if not obscure, are little calculated to attract public attention. Massachusetts justly expects that no such interests shall be neglected. But, by solemn resolutions of her Legislature, by the votes of her people, and by the voice of her history, Massachusetts especially enjoins upon her representatives to see, that, at all hazards, and whatever else may suffer, Freedom shall prevail. I cannot neglect this injunction.

Alike by sympathy with the slave and by determination to save ourselves from wretched thraldom, we are all summoned to the effort now organized for *the emancipation of the National Government* from a degrading influence, hostile to civilization, which, wherever it shows itself, even at a distance, is brutal, vulgar, and mean, constituting an unnatural tyranny, calculated to arouse the generous indignation of good men. Of course, no person, unless ready to say in his heart that there is no God, can doubt the certain result. But this result, like every great good, can be accomplished only by well-directed effort. I know something of the labor and trial which such service imposes; I also know something of the satisfaction it affords, giving to all who truly espouse it a better joy than anything in office or honor. In the weary prostration of months, from which I have now happily risen, the sharpest pang came out of my enforced separation from the cause which was so dear to me; and now my content is in the assurance that to this service I may dedicate the vigorous health which, through medical care and the kindly ministrations of Nature, I am permitted to expect. In this well-founded assurance, I welcome the

trust which has been again conferred upon me, while I once more bespeak the candid judgment of my fellow-citizens, and once more invoke the guardianship of a benignant Providence.

I have the honor to be, fellow-citizens, with grateful regard,

Your faithful servant and Senator,

CHARLES SUMNER.

BOSTON, January 22, 1857.

The following tribute, taken from contemporary newspapers, attests a feeling much above that of ordinary politics, and therefore illustrates this record.

"'CHARLES SUMNER, OF BOSTON.'

"'Three hundred and thirty-three members answered to their names, with the words, "CHARLES SUMNER, of Boston"; and as the Clerk responded with the same words to each vote, they rang upon the ears of the large assembly more than six hundred times during the hour occupied with calling the roll.'

"'It is said, no sound is ever lost, — that every word uttered upon earth is echoed and reëchoed through space forever.'

"Old Massachusetts! nobly thou
This day thy work hast done;
Proudly thou speakest for the Right,
And for thy honored son:

"Three hundred voices on the air,
Ringing the loved name forth;
Three hundred voices echoing back,
'CHARLES SUMNER, of the North!'

"Throughout the land, beyond the sea,
The voices will be heard;
His name shall stand for Liberty,
The freeman's rallying word.

"Throughout the land, beyond the sea,
Above, in arches high,
Voices are ever echoing
A name that ne'er will die.

"Unfurl the banners! even now
The stars more brightly shine:
Is one more glorious than the rest?
Old Bay State, it is thine!

"Gather fresh laurels, twine two wreaths,
Wreaths for a victory won,—
Loved Massachusetts, one for thee,
One for thy chosen son!"

GRATITUDE FOR SYMPATHY OF THE PEOPLE OF VERMONT.

LETTER TO HON. RYLAND FLETCHER, GOVERNOR OF VERMONT, MARCH 7, 1857.

THE Legislature of Vermont, at its recent session, passed a series of joint resolutions, highly complimentary, and indorsing Mr. Sumner's last speech in the Senate. On receiving a copy, Mr. Sumner wrote the following reply.

NEW YORK, Saturday, March 7, 1857.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, RYLAND FLETCHER, GOVERNOR OF VERMONT.

SIR, — At the last moment before leaving for foreign lands in quest of that vigorous health which for nearly ten months has been taken from me, I have received notice of the resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Vermont, and approved by your Excellency, which give the official sanction of a generous, virtuous, and intelligent State to my speech in the Senate on the 19th and 20th of May last, exposing the Crime against Kansas. Such a token is precious to me in every respect, — not only because it assures me of the personal sympathy of the people of Vermont, declared through their representatives, but because it attests their interest in that cause which is more important than any person.

I cannot accept this public approval of my speech without seizing the occasion to express a heartfelt joy that I was permitted to make it, and also my humble

determination, with returning strength, to do something that shall still further unmask the portentous *Barbarism* which has fastened on our Republic, and installed itself in all the high places of power.

I have the honor to be, Sir, with much respect,

Your faithful servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

A LAST WORD FOR KANSAS, ON SAILING FOR EUROPE.

LETTER TO JAMES REDPATH, ESQ., MARCH 7, 1857.

ON BOARD STEAMSHIP FULTON, March 7, 1857.

MY DEAR SIR, — I trust that you and our friends will not be disheartened in efforts for Kansas. Much must still be done, or the night of Slavery will settle down on that beautiful Territory.

Surely the Legislature of Massachusetts will feel the inspiration of a great cause, and pledge itself by a generous appropriation to its support. I hear of constitutional impediments, but I believe that all such will be found to have bottom in the lukewarm hearts of objectors rather than in the Constitution.

There are some who think that anything for Slavery is constitutional, but nothing for Freedom. With me the opposite rule prevails, and I venture to say that any other rule must bring discredit upon a country calling itself a Commonwealth.

I trust, also, that the people of Kansas will stand firm, and that, if need be, they will know how to die for Freedom. Do any sigh for a Thermopylæ? They have it in Kansas, for there is to be fought the great battle between Freedom and Slavery, — by the *ballot-box*, I trust; but I do not forget that all who destroy the ballot-box madly invoke the *cartridge-box*.

With a farewell to my country, as I seek a foreign

land, hoping for health long deferred, I give my last thoughts to suffering Kansas, with devout prayers that the ruffian Usurpation which now treads her down may be peaceably overthrown, and that she may be lifted into the enjoyment of freedom and repose.

Ever faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

P. S. I entrust this to the pilot, and hope it may reach you.

JAMES REDPATH, Esq.

INVITATION TO DINNER BY AMERICAN MERCHANTS IN PARIS.

Letter to the American Merchants at Paris, April 20, 1857.

The following correspondence, with its brief introduction, is copied from *Galignani's Messenger* at Paris.

"Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts. — This distinguished American statesman and orator has been tendered a public dinner by the American merchants residing at Paris, in the following complimentary terms.

"Paris, April 28, 1857.

"Dear Sir, — The American merchants residing in Paris, desirous of expressing their high regard and admiration for your noble independence and distinguished services as a Senator of the United States, respectfully invite you to meet them at a public dinner, to be given at such a time during your sojourn in Paris as may be most convenient to yourself.

"Though well aware that you are habitually accustomed to decline all similar requests, we earnestly hope you will yield to our wishes.

"As citizens of the great Republic, representing many States, and all actively engaged in commercial life, we tender you this tribute, as an evidence of our appreciation of your elevated patriotism, unbending integrity, and spotless honor.

"With the highest esteem, we have the honor to be your friends and fellow-citizens.

"John Munroe,
B. G. Wainwright,
Elliot C. Cowdin,
Samuel P. Holmes,
A. P. Montant,
Thomas N. Dale,
G. F. T. Reed,
James W. Tucker,
George T. Richards,
A. K. P. Cooper,
George Milne,
C. L. Sharpsteen,
Henry Woods,
W. Endicott, Jr.,
John C. Martin,
Walter H. Lewis,
George L. Todd,
David Lane,
V. Mumford Moore,
J. H. Deming,
Jos. D. B. Curtis."

To this invitation Mr. Sumner returned the following reply.

"HÔTEL DE LA PAIX, RUE DE LA PAIX,
April 30, 1857.

GENTLEMEN, — I have been honored by your communication of the 28th April, where, after referring to my services as Senator of the United States, in language generous beyond the ordinary experience of political life, you are pleased to invite me, in the name of the American merchants residing in Paris, to a public dinner, at such time as may be most convenient to myself.

The voice of hospitality is pleasant in a strange land. But the hospitality which you offer is enhanced by the character and number of those who unite in it, among whom I recognize well-known names, intimately associated with the commerce of my country in one of its most important outposts.

There is one aspect in which your invitation is especially grateful. It is this. If I have been able to do anything not unworthy of your approbation, it is because I never failed, whether in majorities or minorities, against all obloquy, and at every hazard, to uphold those principles of Liberty which, just in proportion as they prevail under our Constitution, make us an example to the nations. And since my public course cannot be unknown to you, I am permitted to infer that the public testimony with which you now honor me is offered in some measure to those principles, — dearer to me than any personal distinction, — with which I am proud to know that my name is associated.

The invitation you send me, coming from such a source, couched in terms so flattering, and possessing such an import, presents a temptation difficult to resist. But I

am admonished by the state of my health, which is yet far from its natural vigor, that I must not listen to it, except to express my gratitude. In making this excuse, let me fortify myself by the confession that I left home mainly to withdraw from the excitements of public life, and particularly from all public speaking, in the assurance that by such withdrawal, accompanied by that relaxation which is found in change of pursuit, my convalescence would be completed. The good physician under whose advice I have acted would not admit that by crossing the sea I had been able at once to alter all the conditions under which his advice was given.

I cannot turn coldly from the opportunity you offer me. My heart overflows with best wishes for yourselves individually, and also for the commerce which you conduct, mingled with aspirations that your influence may always add to the welfare and just renown of our country. As American merchants at Paris, you are representatives of the United States on a foreign mission, without diplomatic salary or diplomatic privilege. But it belongs to the felicity of your position that what you do well for yourselves will be well for your country, and, more than any diplomacy, will contribute to strengthen the friendly ties of two powerful nations. Pardon the allusion, when I add that you are the daily industrious workmen in that mighty loom whose frame stands on the coasts of opposite continents, whose threads are Atlantic voyages, whose colors are the various enterprises and activities of a beneficent commerce, and whose well-wrought product is a radiant, speaking tissue, — more beautiful to the mind's eye than any fabric of rarest French skill, more marvellous than any tapestry woven for kings, — where every color mingles

with every thread in completest harmony and on the grandest scale, to display the triumphs and the blessings of Peace.

Accept the assurance of the sincere regard with which I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Your faithful servant and fellow-citizen,

CHARLES SUMNER.

To JOHN MUNROE,
B. G. WAINWRIGHT,
ELLIOT C. COWDIN, Esqrs.,
and others, American merchants at Paris.

The vigilant spirit of Slavery did not fail to note this correspondence. Immediately upon its appearance, a well-known Virginian, the reputed owner of large plantations in right of his wife, and long resident in Paris, addressed a letter to *Galignani's Messenger*, in which he undertook to set forth what he called Mr. Sumner's mission in Europe. Here is a specimen.

"That mission, certainly 'without any diplomatic privilege,' but peradventure not without perquisites, is to initiate, and, if the exigencies of the cotton market and manufacture do not forbid it, to organize, a systematic agitation in this and the British capital against the Southern States of the Confederacy, and that 'peculiar institution' of theirs, so tenderly nursed of yore, and transmitted to them by dear Old Mother England, and which in very modern times has been not less cherished and sustained by the 'enterprise and activity' on the coast of Africa of some of her Puritanical progeny in the New World. Under these circumstances can any such subdolous plea as that put forward excuse these 'American merchants' from lending themselves to such agencies and influences? If they were sordid and self-seeking adventurers, in pursuit of *political* capital, rather than the honorable rewards of a liberal and enlightened trade, one could understand, or rather would not marvel at, this pseudo-patriotic partisanship, this unfraternal display of their *sectional* colors in a foreign land."

Thus was the invalid in search of health pursued by the same malign spirit from which he had originally suffered.

OUR POLITICS SEEN FROM A DISTANCE.

LETTER TO A FRIEND, DATED HEIDELBERG, SEPTEMBER 11, 1857.

THE following letter found its way into the papers of the time.

HEIDELBERG, September 11, 1857.

MY DEAR ——, — Weeks have now passed since I have seen a letter or newspaper from home. During this time I have been travelling away from news, and am now famished. On arrival at Antwerp, I trust to find letters at last.

I have been ransacking Switzerland; I have visited most of its lakes, and crossed several of its mountains, mule-back. My strength has not allowed me to venture upon any of those foot expeditions, the charm of Swiss travel, by which you reach places out of the way; but I have seen much, and have gained health constantly.

I have crossed the Alps by the St. Gothard, and then recrossed by the Grand St. Bernard, passing a night with the monks and dogs. I have spent a day at the foot of Mont Blanc, and another on the wonderful Lake Leman. I have been in the Pyrenees, in the Alps, in the Channel Isles. You will next hear of me in the Highlands of Scotland.

I see our politics now in distant perspective, and I am more than ever satisfied that our course is right. It is Slavery which degrades our country, and prevents

its example from being all-conquering. In fighting our battle at home we fight the battle of Freedom everywhere. Be assured, I shall return, not only with renewed strength, but with renewed determination to give myself to our great cause.

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

FAREWELL ON SAILING FOR EUROPE
A SECOND TIME IN QUEST OF HEALTH.

LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON BOARD STEAMER VANDERBILT, NEW YORK HARBOR, MAY 22, 1858.

TO THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS: —

TWO years have now passed, since, when in the enjoyment of perfect health, I was suddenly made an invalid. Throughout this protracted period, amidst various vicissitudes of convalescence, I seemed to be slowly regaining the health that had been taken from me, until I was encouraged to believe myself on the verge of perfect recovery.

But injuries so grave as those originally received are not readily repaired; and a recent relapse painfully admonishes me, that, although enjoying many of the conditions of prosperous convalescence, I am not yet beyond the necessity of caution. This has been confirmed by the physicians in Boston and Philadelphia most familiar with my case, who, in concurrence with counsels previously given by medical authorities in Europe, have enjoined travel as best calculated to promote restoration. Anxious to spare no effort for this end, so long deferred, I to-day sail for France.

To the generous people of Massachusetts, who have honored me with an important trust, and cheered me by so much sympathy, I wish to express the thanks

which now palpitate in my bosom, while I say to them all collectively, as I would say to a friend, Farewell!

These valedictory words would be imperfect, if I did not seize this occasion to declare, what I have often said less publicly, that, had I foreseen originally the duration of my disability, I should at once have resigned my seat in the Senate, making way for a servant more fortunate in the precious advantages of health. I did not do so, because, like other invalids, I lived in the belief that I was soon to be well, and was reluctant to renounce the opportunity of again exposing the hideous Barbarism of Slavery, now more than ever transfused into the National Government, infecting its whole policy and degrading its whole character. Besides, I was often assured, and encouraged to feel, that to every sincere lover of civilization my vacant chair was a perpetual speech.

CHARLES SUMNER.

ON BOARD STEAMER VANDERBILT,
NEW YORK HARBOR, May 22, 1858.

HONOR TO THE INVENTOR OF THE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH.

LETTER TO PROFESSOR MORSE, IN EXCUSING HIMSELF FROM A DINNER AT PARIS, AUGUST 17, 1858.

HÔTEL AND RUE DE LA PAIX, PARIS,
Tuesday, August 17, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR, — I have fresh occasion to be unhappy that I am still an invalid, because it prevents me from joining in the well-deserved honors which our countrymen here are about to offer you.

As I would not be thought indifferent to the occasion, I seize the moment to express in this informal manner my humble gratitude for the great discovery with which your name will be forever associated. Through you Civilization has made one of her surest and grandest triumphs, beyond any ever won on a field of battle; nor do I go beyond the line of most cautious truth, when I add, that, if mankind had yet arrived at a just appreciation of its benefactors, it would welcome such a conqueror with more than a marshal's baton.

I write to you frankly, and with a still cordial memory of that distant day, when, in the company of a friend who is no longer on earth, I first had the happiness of taking you by the hand.

Believe me, my dear Sir, with much regard,

Ever sincerely yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

PROFESSOR MORSE.

LONGING FOR DUTIES OF POSITION.

From a Letter to a Friend, dated at Aix, Savoy, September 11, 1858.

This extract is taken from the public papers of the time.

Aix, Savoy, September 11, 1858.

. . .

LOOK at the map of Europe, and you will find, nestling in the mountains of Savoy, between Switzerland and France, the little village of Aix, generally known as Aix-les-Bains, from the baths which give it fame. There I am now. The country about is most beautiful, the people simple and kind.

My life is devoted to health. I wish that I could say that I am not still an invalid; yet, except when attacked by the pain on my chest, I am now comfortable, and enjoy my baths, my walks, and the repose and incognito which I find here.

I begin the day with *douches*, hot and cold, — and when thoroughly exhausted, am wrapped in sheet and blanket, and conveyed to my hotel, and laid on my bed. After my walk, I find myself obliged again to take to my bed for two hours before dinner. But this whole treatment is in pleasant contrast with the protracted suffering from fire which made the summer a torment. And yet I fear that I must return to that treatment.

It is with a pang unspeakable that I find myself thus arrested in the labors of life and in the duties of my position. This is harder to bear than the fire. I do not hear of friends engaged in active service — like Trumbull in Illinois — without a feeling of envy.

. . . . .

CHARLES SUMNER.

INDEPENDENCE AND UNITY OF ITALY.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT NEW YORK,
FEBRUARY 17, 1860.

THIS meeting was at the City Assembly Rooms, and was addressed by Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, Hon. Charles King, Rev. H. W. Bellows, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Hon. Joseph Hoxie, and Professor O. M. Mitchel. According to the *New York Tribune*, the letter of Mr. Sumner "was received with much enthusiasm."

SENATE CHAMBER, February 16, 1860.

GENTLEMEN, — You do me no more than justice, when you suppose that my sympathies are with Italy in her present noble struggle. If I do not attend the meeting at New York, according to the invitation with which I am honored, it is because other duties here keep me away.

To the cause of Human Freedom everywhere I am bound by all ties, whether of feeling or principle. To Italy also — venerable, yet ever young, with that fatal gift of beauty which from all time she has worn — I confess a sentiment of love and reverence; I am sorrowful in her sorrow, and happy in her happiness.

Surely, by her past history, and all that she has done for human improvement, we are her debtors. Without Italian genius what now were modern civilization? There is no art, or science, or activity, or grace, in which she has not excelled or led the way. If I went

into detail, I must mention not only sculpture, painting, engraving, and music, but also astronomy, navigation, bookkeeping, and jurisprudence; and I must present an array of great names, such as no other country can boast. And to all these I must add the practical discoveries of the mariner's compass, the barometer, the telescope applied to astronomy, and the pendulum as a measure of time.

To the political skeptics and infidels who affect to doubt the capacity for freedom of this illustrious people I would say, that Italy, in modern times, was the earliest home of political science, and the earliest author of some of those political truths which have since passed into principles. Besides, divided into separate, sovereign States, with separate systems of legislation, her condition is coincident with our own, to the extent of possessing those local facilities for self-government which are our boast. And then there is the spirit of her sons, as shown in recent efforts, giving assurance of courage, and of that rarer wisdom which knows how to guide and temper courage, both of which shone so conspicuous in the Venetian Manin, worthy compeer of our own Washington.

Allow me to add, that I confidently look to the day when we may welcome into the fellowship of nations a community new in external form, but old in constituent parts, — separate in local governments, but bound in perfect union, with one national flag, one national coin, and one national principle, giving to all the strength of unity, — *E Pluribus Unum*, — and constituting the United States of Italy. And may God speed this good time!

Accept the assurance of the respect with which I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

TWO LESSONS FROM THE LIFE OF WASHINGTON.

LETTER TO THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT ASSOCIATION OF THE FIRST SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 21, 1860.

SENATE CHAMBER, February 21, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — It would be a pleasure to be with you at your celebration of the Birthday of Washington, according to the invitation with which you have honored me. But other duties will keep me away.

It is always a delight to listen to the praise of Washington, particularly when his full life is set forth, and he is shown in his real character, ever wise, firm, and true, teaching two commanding lessons: first, by the achievements and trials of a seven years' war, that his fellow-countrymen should not be willing to be slaves; and, secondly, by the repeated declarations of his life, and especially by his great example in his last will and testament, that his fellow-countrymen should not be willing to be slave-masters. I do not know for which he is to be most honored.

Accept my thanks for the personal kindness of your letter, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

GEORGE F. GORDON, Esq.

MACAULAY ON SLAVERY.

COMMUNICATION TO THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, MARCH 3, 1860.

THE same paper contained the article of Macaulay entitled "The West Indies," from the *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1825, Vol. XLI. pp. 464–488. The day after its appearance, the *New York Herald*, in a leader with the caption, "*Macaulay, Sumner, and Slavery*," sought to disparage the testimony, saying, among other things:—

"What Mr. Sumner now introduces is a proof how badly off the party must be for weapons, when they rake them up from the dead magazines of another generation, and written by a youth a little over twenty years of age; or Mr. Sumner has not yet recovered his usual strength of mind, since the injury he received a few years ago at the Capitol. And what does his article amount to? That the British planters in the West Indies treated their slaves very badly, which may or may not be true. But from the abuse of the institution in one place he argues against the policy of its continued existence in any other part of the world. He might as well conclude, that, because many of the English are cruel to their horses, and that it was necessary to pass an Act of Parliament for their protection, therefore horses ought to be emancipated in the United States, and let loose through the country. An argument from the abuse to the disuse of anything is the poorest kind of logic."

Such was the tone of discussion on the eve of the Presidential election destined to decide the fate of American Slavery.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE:—

SIR,—I ask attention to an eloquent and characteristic article on Slavery, by Macaulay, never yet printed in our country with his name. It is in an old number of the "Edinburgh Review," while Jeffrey was its editor, and in point of time preceded the famous article on Milton. It is, indeed, the earliest contribution

of the illustrious writer to that Review, of which he became a chief support and ornament. As such, it belongs to the curiosities of literature, even if it did not possess intrinsic interest from subject and style.

Here are seen, no longer in germ, but almost in perfect development, those same great elements of style which appear in the maturer essays and the History, — mastery of language, clearness of statement, force, splendor of illustration, an irrepressible sequence of thought and argument, and that same whip of scorpions which he afterward flourished over Barère: all these are conspicuous in this first effort, where he utters the honest, gushing indignation of his soul. Never has Slavery inspired speaker or writer to more complete and scornful condemnation.

The article was called forth by British Slavery in the West Indies; but it is just as applicable to American Slavery. *Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur.* Every line bears upon the slave-drivers of our country, with greater force even than upon the slave-drivers of the West Indies; for audacity here goes further than it was ever pushed in the British dominions. It is interesting to find how exact the parallel becomes. In the picture of illiberal men conspiring to support Slavery Macaulay seems to delineate us.

"The slave-drivers may boast, that, if our cause has received support from honest men of all religious and political parties, theirs has tended in as great a degree to combine and conciliate every form of violence and illiberality. Tories and Radicals, prebendaries and field-preachers, are to be found in their ranks. The only requisites for one who aspires to enlist are a front of brass and a tongue of venom."[1]

[1] Edinburgh Review, Vol. XLI. p. 465.

Aiming to exhibit Slavery in its laws, without dwelling on the accumulated instances of cruelty, he puts the case on the strongest ground; and here his unimpeachable witness is the statute-book itself. But this same argument bears with equal force upon *our* Slavery; so that, in reading his indignant exposure of the West India jurisprudence, we see rising before us the kindred enormities of our own Slave States, and acknowledge the truth of his generous words.

He seems also to have anticipated that flagrant sophism, which, under the guise of Popular Sovereignty, insists that men shall be at liberty — "perfectly free" is the phrase of the Nebraska Bill — to buy and sell fellowmen.

"If you will adopt the principles of Liberty, adopt them altogether. Every argument which you can urge in support of your own claims might be employed, with far greater justice, in favor of the emancipation of your bondsmen. When that event shall have taken place, your demand will deserve consideration. At present, what you require under the name of Freedom is nothing but unlimited power to oppress. It is the freedom of Nero." [1]

The threats of disunion, coming from slave-drivers, are also foreshown, and treated with the scorn they merit.

"Who can refrain from thinking of Captain Lemuel Gulliver, who, while raised sixty feet from the ground on the hand of the King of Brobdignag, claps his hand on his sword and tells his Majesty that he knows how to defend himself? You will rebel! . . . . But this is mere trifling. Are you, in point of fact, at this moment able to protect yourselves against your slaves without our assistance? If you can

[1] Edinburgh Review, Vol. XLI. p. 481.

still rise up and lie down in security, — if you can still eat the bread of the fatherless and grind the faces of the poor, — if you can still hold your petty Parliaments, and say your little speeches, and move your little motions, — if you can still outrage and insult the Parliament and people of England, — to what do you owe it ?"[1]

The sensitiveness of slave property — the same in our Slave States as in the British West Indies — is aptly described in the remark, that a pamphlet of Mr. Stephen or a speech of Mr. Brougham is sufficient to excite all the slaves in the colonies to rebel. And it is shown that in a servile war the master *must* be loser; for his enemies are his chattels. Whether the slave conquer or fall, he is alike lost to the owner. In the mean time, the soil lies uncultivated, the machinery is destroyed. And when the possessions of the planter are restored to him, they have been changed into a desert.[2]

Here also is an exhibition of the incompatibility between Slavery and Christianity, which ought to be read in every Southern pulpit: —

"The immorality and irreligion of the slaves are the necessary consequences of their political and personal degradation. They are not considered by the law as human beings. . . . . *They must become men before they can become Christians.* . . . . Can a preacher prevail on his hearers strictly to fulfil their conjugal duties in a country where no protection is given to their conjugal rights, — in a country where the husband and wife may, at the pleasure of the master or by process of law, be in an instant separated forever ? . . . . The great body of the colonists have reso-

[1] Edinburgh Review, Vol. XLI. p. 481.
[2] Ibid., pp. 486, 487.

lutely opposed religious instruction; and they are in the right. They know, though their misinformed friends in England do not know, that Christianity and Slavery cannot long exist together."[1]

Such is the philippic against Slavery by the first writer of the English language in our day, and one of the first in all times. As testimony to a sacred cause, it is priceless; as a contribution to literature, it cannot be forgotten. Why it was suppressed by American publishers, who gave us the earliest collection of Macaulay's Essays ever printed in England or America, I know not. Unhappily, this suppression was too much in harmony with the received American system from that day to this, whether in publishing Humboldt's work on Cuba, the Bishop of Oxford's work on the American Church, or the engraving of Ary Scheffer's "Christus Consolator," from all of which the slave is shut out. That this blame may not fall upon the author himself, it is important to know that the American collection was made without any list supplied by him. In the modesty of his nature, he regarded his contributions to Reviews as fugitive pieces, which he abandoned to the world, without caring to gather them together. It will be for posterity to rejudge this judgment.

In this statement, I rely upon personal recollection of conversations with him. More than twenty years ago — as also more recently — I was in the habit of meeting the great writer in the society of London; and I remember well how, on one of these occasions, when told that an American bookseller proposed to publish a collection of his articles, he very positively protested

[1] Edinburgh Review, Vol. XLI. p. 472.

against it, and refused to furnish a list. Nor is it out of place to add here, that, while his wonderful conversation left on the mind an ineffaceable impression of eloquence and fulness, perhaps without parallel, it also showed a character of singular integrity.

This article is not alone in attesting his sympathy with the Antislavery cause. The first public appearance of Macaulay, while yet a very young man, was at an Antislavery meeting; and one of his most stinging speeches, at the maturity of his powers, in the House of Commons, bore testimony to the depth and constancy of this sentiment.[1] This was natural; for he was son of Zachary Macaulay, one of the devoted Abolitionists who helped to carry, first, the abolition of the slave-trade, and then, at a later day, the abolition of Slavery itself, in the British dominions.

The services of the father, as friend of the slave, have been aptly commemorated by a cenotaph in Westminster Abbey, situated in the nave, on the left side of the great door as you enter, and close to the imposing monument of Fox. The son now lies in the same historic burial-place and beneath the same mighty roof,[2] but in Poets' Corner, distant by more than the whole length of the nave from the tablet erected in honor of his father. In all that multitude of monuments to the illustrious dead, if we except the line of kings, there is but one other instance of father and son enshrined in the Abbey, and that is Lord Chatham and William Pitt, whose monuments are also distant from each other by more than the whole length of the nave.

[1] Speech on the Sugar Duties, February 26, 1845: Speeches, Vol. II. pp. 126, 127.

[2] Born October 25, 1800; died December 28, 1859.

Such is the conspicuous fellowship of the two Pitts and the Macaulays, father and son, although most unlike in circumstances of life and the services which have secured this common foothold of immortality. In each case, the father, even with the fame of Lord Chatham, has new glory from the son. The resting-places of the two Pitts are known at once on entering the Abbey. Hereafter, the stranger, who has stood with grateful admiration before the grave of the younger Macaulay, will seek with reverent step the simple tribute to his father, the Abolitionist, — mindful that the love of Human Freedom in which the son was cradled and schooled gave to his character some of its best features, and to his career of authorship its earliest triumph.

My purpose is simply to introduce this new-found testimony against Slavery, and not to dwell on the life or character of the author. If I followed a hint from him, the way would be open. Nobody can forget that in one of his most magnificent essays he has availed himself of the interest, transient it may have been, created by a newly discovered prose work of Milton, and has reminded his readers that the dexterous Capuchins never choose to preach on the life and miracles of a Saint till they have awakened the devotional feelings of their auditors by exhibiting some relic of him, — a thread of his garment, a lock of his hair, or a drop of his blood. Here, indeed, is a relic of Macaulay; but I venture no further.

CHARLES SUMNER.

STATUE OF HORACE MANN.

LETTER TO DR. SAMUEL G. HOWE, MARCH 5, 1860.

FROM the public papers of the time.

SENATE CHAMBER, March 5, 1860.

MY DEAR HOWE, — I am glad to know that you are moving in earnest for a public statue to Horace Mann.

Absence, and not indifference, is my excuse for not associating myself at first with this purpose. Though tardily, I do it now most sincerely, and with my whole heart. I send you for it one hundred dollars; but you will please not to measure my interest in this tribute to a public benefactor by the sum which I contribute. Were I able, it would be ten times as large. If each person in Massachusetts who has been benefited by the vast and generous labors of Horace Mann, — each person who hates Intemperance, and who hates Slavery, — each person who loves Education, and who loves humane efforts for the prisoner, the poor, and the insane, — should contribute a mite only, then his statue would be of gold. Why not at once appeal to good men, and insist upon organization throughout the Commonwealth, reaching into every School District, so that all may have an opportunity to contribute? Pray do this, and if

I can serve you any way about it, command me, and believe me,

Always yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

P. S. — Mr. Seward, who is not a Massachusetts man, asks me to put his name down for fifty dollars. I enclose his subscription.

USURPATION OF THE SENATE IN IMPRISONING A CITIZEN.

TWO SPEECHES, ON THE IMPRISONMENT OF THADDEUS HYATT FOR REFUSING TO TESTIFY IN THE HARPER'S FERRY INVESTIGATION, IN THE SENATE, MARCH 12 AND JUNE 15, 1860.

ON his return to the Senate, at the opening of Congress, December 5, 1859, Mr. Sumner encountered the agitation arising from the famous attempt of John Brown at Harper's Ferry. Though warned to enter slowly into the full responsibilities of his position, he was constantly moved by incidents arising from this agitation.

On the first day of the session, Mr. Mason, of Virginia, moved the appointment of a committee "to inquire into the facts attending the late invasion and seizure of the armory and arsenal of the United States at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia, by a band of armed men," and the long resolution concluded with "power to send for persons and papers." The Committee was appointed, with Mr. Mason as chairman, and, in the course of its duties, summoned John Brown, Jr., of Kansas, and F. B. Sanborn and James Redpath, of Massachusetts, who severally failed to appear. Thaddeus Hyatt, of New York, appeared, but refused to testify. Thereupon Mr. Mason reported from his committee the following resolution.

"Whereas Thaddeus Hyatt, appearing at the bar of the Senate, in custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, pursuant to the resolution of the Senate of the 6th of March, instant, was required, by order of the Senate then made, to answer the following questions, under oath and in writing: '1st, What excuse have you for not appearing before the select committee of the Senate, in pursuance of the summons served on you on the 24th day of January, 1860? 2d, Are you now ready to appear before said committee, and answer such proper questions as shall be put to you by said committee?' — time to answer the same being given until the 9th day of March following: And whereas, on the said last-named day, the said Thaddeus Hyatt, again appearing, in like custody, at the bar of the Senate, presented

a paper, accompanied by an affidavit, which he stated was his answer to said questions; and it appearing, upon examination thereof, that said Thaddeus Hyatt has assigned no sufficient excuse in answer to the question first aforesaid, and in answer to said second question has not declared himself ready to appear and answer before said committee of the Senate, as set forth in said question, and has not purged himself of the contempt with which he stands charged: Therefore,

"*Be it resolved*, That the said Thaddeus Hyatt be committed by the Sergeant-at-Arms to the common jail of the District of Columbia, to be kept in close custody until he shall signify his willingness to answer the questions propounded to him by the Senate; and for the commitment and detention of the said Thaddeus Hyatt this resolution shall be a sufficient warrant.

"*Resolved*, That, whenever the officer having the said Thaddeus Hyatt in custody shall be informed by said Hyatt that he is ready and willing to answer the questions aforesaid, it shall be the duty of such officer to deliver the said Thaddeus Hyatt over to the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, whose duty it shall be again to bring him before the bar of the Senate, when so directed by the Senate."

On the question upon its passage, March 12, 1860, Mr. Sumner spoke as follows.

MR. PRESIDENT, — It is related in English parliamentary history, that, on a certain occasion, when the House of Commons was about ordering the commitment of a somewhat too famous witness to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Speaker interfered by volunteering to say, that "the House ought to pause before they came to a decision upon a point in which the liberty of the subject was so materially concerned."[1] That same question is now before us. We are to pass on the liberty of a citizen.

Pardon me, if I say that such a question cannot at any time be trivial. But it has an unaccustomed magnitude on this occasion, because the case is novel in this body; so that what you now do, besides involving the liberty of the gentleman at the bar, will estab-

[1] Case of the witness Mrs. Clarke, in the inquiry into the conduct of the Duke of York, February 7, 1809: Hansard, Parliamentary Debates, Vol. XII. col. 436.

lish a precedent, which, in itself, will be a law for other cases hereafter.

Now, if it be conceded that the Senate is invested with all the large powers claimed by the Houses of Parliament, then I cannot doubt its power in the present case, although I might well question the expediency of exercising it. But this is notoriously untrue. It is well known that Parliament is above the constraint of a written Constitution; and it has been more than once declared — much to the indignation of our Revolutionary fathers — that it is "omnipotent" to such extent that it can do anything it pleases, except make a man of a woman, or a woman of a man. The Senate has no such large powers; it is not "omnipotent," but under the constraint of a written Constitution. Instead of authority in all possible cases, it has authority only in certain specific cases.

If the Senate can summon witnesses to its bar, and compel them to testify, under pains and penalties, it must be by virtue of powers delegated in the Constitution, — I do not say by express grant, but at least by positive intendment. I say positive intendment; for nothing is to be presumed against liberty.

There are certain cases in which the power is clear: first, and most conspicuously, in the trial of impeachments; secondly, in determining the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members; and, thirdly, in punishing its members for disorderly behavior. All these proceedings are judicial, as well as political, in character, and carry with them, as a natural incident, the power to compel witnesses to testify.

Beyond these three cases, which stand on the express words of the Constitution, there are two other cases,

quasi-judicial in character, which, though not supported by express words of the Constitution, have grown out of necessity and reason, amounting to positive intendment, and are sanctioned by precedents. I refer, first, to the inquiry into an alleged violation of the privileges of this body, as where a copy of a treaty was furtively obtained and published; and, secondly, to the inquiry into conduct of servants of the Senate, like that now proceeding with regard to the Printer, on the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KING]. If I were asked to indicate the principle on which these two cases stood, I should say it was that just and universal right of *self-defence* inherent in every parliamentary body, as in every court, and also in every individual, but which is limited closely by the simple necessities of the case.

Such are the five cases in which this extraordinary power has been heretofore exercised: the first three standing on the text of the Constitution, and the other two on the right of self-defence necessarily inherent in the Senate; all five sanctioned by precedents of this body; all five judicial in character; all five judicial also in purpose and intent; and all five agreeing in this final particular, that they have no legislative purpose or intent. Beyond these cases there is no precedent for the exercise by the Senate of the power in question.

It is now proposed to add a new case, most clearly without any support in the Constitution, without any support in the right of *self-defence* inherent in the Senate, and without any support in the precedents of the Senate.

A committee has been appointed to inquire into the facts attending the late invasion and seizure of the

armory and arsenal at Harper's Ferry by a band of armed men, and report whether the same was attended by armed resistance to the authorities and public force of the United States, and by the murder of any citizens of Virginia, or of any troops sent there to protect public property; whether such invasion was made under color of any organization intended to subvert the government of any of the States of the Union; the character and extent of such organization; *whether any citizens of the United States, not present, were implicated therein or accessory thereto, by contributions of money, arms, munitions, or otherwise;* the character and extent of the military equipment in the hands or under the control of such armed band; where, how, and when the same was obtained and transported to the place invaded; also, to report what legislation, if any, is necessary by the Government for the future preservation of the peace of the country and the safety of public property; with power to send for persons and papers.

And this committee, after several weeks of session, now invokes the power of the Senate to compel the witness to testify. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], who calls for the imprisonment of an American citizen, has shown no authority for such an exercise of power in the Constitution, or in the admitted right of self-defence, or in the precedents of the Senate. He cannot show any such authority. It does not exist.

Surely, where the Constitution, and reason, and precedent, all three, are silent, we might well hesitate to exercise a power so transcendent. But I shall not stop here. I go further, and point out two specific defects in the resolution of the Senate.

First. The inquiry which it institutes is clearly judicial in character, — without, however, any judicial purpose, or looking to any judicial end. The committee is essentially a Tribunal, with power of denunciation, but without power of punishment, — sitting with closed doors, having the secrecy of the Inquisition or the Star Chamber, or, if you please, the Grand Jury, — with power to investigate facts involving the guilt of absent persons, and to denounce fellow-citizens as felons and traitors. If such a power is lodged anywhere outside of judicial tribunals, it must be in the House of Representatives, as the Grand Inquest of the Nation, with its power to impeach all civil officers, from the President down; but it cannot be in the Senate. Let me cite an illustration. The Constitution of Maryland provides expressly that "the House of Delegates may inquire, on the oath of witnesses, into all complaints, grievances, and offences, as the Grand Inquest of the State, and may commit any person for any crime to the public jail, there to remain until discharged by due course of law." But I deny that the Senate of that neighbor State can erect itself into a Grand Inquest.

If the Senate of the United States have power to make the present inquiry, then, on any occasion of alleged crime, of whatever nature, whether of treason or murder or riot, it may rush to the assistance of the grand juries of the District, or, still further, it may rush to the assistance of the grand juries of Virginia; in short, it will be an inquest of commanding character, and with far-reaching, all-pervading process, supplementary and ancillary to the local inquest, — or, rather, so transcendent in powers, that by its side the local inquest will be dwarfed into insignificance. This

cannot be proper or constitutional. But perhaps I am especially sensitive on this point; for, as a citizen of Massachusetts, I cannot forget that her Bill of Rights, originally the work of John Adams, provides expressly that the legislative department shall never exercise judicial powers, and the judicial department shall never exercise legislative powers, — "to the end," as is solemnly declared, "it may be a government of laws, and not of men."

But, assuming that the resolution is defective so far as it constitutes an inquest into crime, it may be said that the witness should be compelled to answer the other parts. Surely, the Senate will not resort to any such refinement in order to imprison a citizen.

Secondly. But there is a broader objection still: that, whatever may be the power of the Senate in judicial cases, it cannot compel the testimony of a witness in a proceeding of which the declared purpose is merely legislative. Officers of the Government communicate with Congress and its committees simply by letter. They are not summoned from distant posts, or even from their offices here. And I know not why a distant citizen, charged with no offence, and in every right the peer of any office-holder, should be treated with less consideration. If information be desired from him for any legislative purpose, let him communicate it in the way most convenient to himself, and most consistent with those rights of the citizen which all are bound to respect.

At all events, if this power is to be exercised, let it not be under a simple resolution of the Senate, but by virtue of a general law, passed by both Houses, and

approved by the President, so that the citizen shall be surrounded with certain safeguards.

Mr. President, I confidently submit that a power so entirely without support, and also so obnoxious to criticism, at the same time that it is so vast, is not to be carelessly exercised. You cannot send the witness to prison without establishing a new precedent and commencing a new class of cases. You will declare that the Senate, at any time, — not merely in the performance of admitted judicial duties, but also in the performance of mere legislative duties, — may drag a citizen from the most distant village of the most distant State, and compel his testimony, involving the guilt or innocence of absent persons, or, it may be, of the witness himself. This is a fearful prerogative, and permit me to say, that, in assuming it, you liken yourselves to the Jesuits, at the period of their most hateful supremacy, when it was said that their power was a sword whose handle was at Rome and whose point was in the most distant places. You take into your hands a sword whose handle will be in this Chamber, to be clutched by a mere partisan majority, and whose point will be in every corner of the Republic.

If the present case were doubtful, which I do not admit, I feel that I cannot go wrong, when I lean to the side of Liberty. But, even admitting that you have the power, is this the occasion to use it? Is it, upon the whole, expedient? Is the object to be accomplished worth the sacrifice? It is well to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.

For myself, Sir, I confess a feeling of gratitude to the witness, who, knowing nothing which he desires to conceal, and chiefly anxious that the liberties of all may

not suffer through him, feeble in body and broken in health, hardly able to endure the fatigue of appearing at your bar, now braves the prison which you menace, and thrusts his arm as a bolt to arrest an unauthorized and arbitrary proceeding.

The resolutions were adopted March 12, 1860, and on the same day Mr. Hyatt was committed to the common jail of Washington.

On the 15th of June, 1860, Mr. Mason, of Virginia, Chairman of the Harper's Ferry Investigating Committee, in submitting his final report, further submitted the following order.

"*Ordered*, That Thaddeus Hyatt, a witness confined in the jail of this city for refusal to appear and testify before said committee, be discharged from custody, and that a copy of this order be delivered to the jailer by the Sergeant-at-Arms, as his warrant for discharging said prisoner."

On the question upon its passage, Mr. Sumner spoke as follows.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I welcome with pleasure the proposition for the discharge of Mr. Hyatt from his long incarceration in the filthy jail where he has been detained by the order of the Senate. But I am unwilling that this act of justice should be done to a much injured citizen, without for one moment exposing the injustice which he has received at your hands.

The case, it seems to me, can be made as plain as a diagram.

We must not forget a fundamental difference between the powers of the House of Representatives and the powers of the Senate. It is from the former that the Senator from Virginia has drawn his precedents, and here is his mistake.

To the House of Representatives expressly are given by the Constitution *inquisitorial* powers, while no such powers are given to the Senate. This is contained in

the words, "The House of Representatives shall have the *sole* power of impeachment." Here, then, obviously, is something delegated to the House, and not delegated to the Senate, — namely, those inquiries in their nature preliminary to impeachment, which may or may not end in impeachment; and since, by the Constitution, every "civil officer" of the national government may be impeached, the *inquisitorial* powers of the House may be directed against every "civil officer," from the President down to the lowest on the list.

This is an extensive power, but it is confined solely to the House. Strictly speaking, the Senate has no general *inquisitorial* powers. It has, we know, *judicial powers* in three cases under the Constitution: —

1. To try impeachments;

2. To judge the elections, returns, and qualifications of its members;

3. To punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, to expel a member.

In the execution of these powers, the Senate has the attributes of a court, and, according to established precedents, it may summon witnesses and compel their testimony, although it may well be doubted if a law be not necessary even to the execution of this power.

Besides these three cases, expressly named in the Constitution, there are two others, where it has already undertaken to exercise *judicial powers*, not by virtue of express words, but in *self-defence*: —

1. With regard to the conduct of its servants, as of its Printer;

2. When its privileges have been violated, as in the

case of William Duane,[1] by a libel, or in the case of Nugent,[2] by obtaining and divulging a treaty while still under seal of secrecy.

It will be observed that these two classes of cases are not sustained by any text of the Constitution. If sustained at all, it must be by that principle of universal jurisprudence, and also of natural law, which gives to every body, whether natural or artificial, the right to protect its own existence, — in other words, the great right of self-defence. And I submit that no principle less solid can sustain this exercise of power. It is not enough to say that such a power would be *convenient,* highly convenient, or important. *It must be absolutely essential to the self-preservation of the body;* and even then, in the absence of any law, it must be open in our country to the gravest doubts.

"Doubtless," says Blackstone, "all arbitrary powers, well executed, are *the most convenient.*" [3] But *mere convenience* is not a proper reason, under a free government, for the assumption of powers not granted; and this is especially the case where the powers are arbitrary and despotic, and touch the liberty of the citizen.

[1] Annals of Congress, 6th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 113, March 20, 1800.

[2] As this case was in Executive Session of the Senate, there is no public record of it. From the daily press of the time it appears, that, March 23, 1848, Nugent, a correspondent of the *New York Herald*, was arrested by order of the Senate, and committed to the Sergeant-at-Arms, for obtaining surreptitiously and publishing the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; that he remained in such custody until April 25th, and perhaps longer; that he refused to answer questions concerning the treaty; that he was twice taken before Judge Cranch, of the United States Court, by *Habeas Corpus;* that the Sergeant-at-Arms returned for answer to the writ, that he held the prisoner by virtue of a warrant of the Vice-President, in pursuance of certain proceedings of the Senate in Executive Session, which he could not divulge, and that the question gave rise to much debate in Executive Session. See especially *Baltimore Sun*, March 24, 26, 29, April 18, 1848.

[3] Commentaries, Vol. IV. p. 350.

Now, if the present inquiry were in the House of Representatives, and were directed against the President or the Secretary of War, on the ground of negligence or malfeasance at an important moment, it would be clearly within the jurisdiction of that body, which has the *sole* power of impeachment; but it would not come within the jurisdiction of the Senate, until it became the duty of the latter body to try the impeachment instituted by the House.

But the present inquiry is neither preliminary to impeachment nor on the trial of an impeachment. It has no such element. It is precisely the same as if an inquiry should be instituted into the murder of Dr. Burdell in New York, or into the burning of slaves in Alabama, or into the banks of New York, or into the conduct of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in alleged obstructions of the Fugitive Slave Bill, — with regard to all which the Senate has no judicial powers. And yet it has judicial powers in all these cases, precisely to the same extent that it has in the case of John Brown at Harper's Ferry.

I know it is said that this power is necessary *in aid of legislation.* I deny the necessity. *Convenient,* at times, it may be; but *necessary,* never. We do not drag members of the Cabinet or the President to testify before a committee, *in aid of legislation;* but I say, without hesitation, they can claim no immunity which does not belong equally to the humblest citizen. Mr. Hyatt and Mr. Sanborn have rights as ample as if they were office-holders. Such a power as this — which, without the sanction of law, and merely at the will of a partisan majority, may be employed to ransack the most distant States, and to drag citizens before the Senate all

the way from Wisconsin or from South Carolina — may be convenient, and to certain persons may seem to be necessary. Throughout all time alleged necessity has been the apology for wrong.

> "So spake the Fiend, and with *necessity*,
> The tyrant's plea, excused his devilish deeds."

Such, according to Milton, was the practice among the fallen angels.

Let me be understood as admitting the power of the Senate, where it is essential to its own protection or the protection of its privileges, but not where it is required merely in aid of legislation. The difference is world-wide between what is required for *protection* and what is required merely for *aid;* and here I part from Senators with whom I am proud on other matters to act. They hold that this great power may be exercised, not merely for the *protection* of the Senate, but also for its *aid* in framing a bill or in maturing any piece of legislation. To aid a committee of this body merely in a legislative purpose, a citizen, guilty of no crime, charged with no offence, presumed to be innocent, honored and beloved in his neighborhood, may be seized, handcuffed, kidnapped, and dragged away from home, hurried across State lines, brought here as criminal, and then thrust into jail. The mere statement of the case shows the dangerous absurdity of such a claim. "Nephew," said Algernon Sidney in prison, on the night before his execution, "I value not my own life a chip; but what concerns me is, that the *law* which takes away my life may hang every one of you, whenever it is thought convenient." It was a dangerous *law* that aroused the indignation of the English patriot. But in the present

case there is not even a law, — nothing but an order made by a fractional part of Congress.

There are Senators here who pretend to find in the Constitution the right to carry slaves into the National Territories. That such Senators should also find in the same Constitution the right to make a slave of Mr. Hyatt or Mr. Sanborn, or of anybody else, merely to aid legislation, is not astonishing; but I am at a loss how Senators who love Freedom can find any such right in the Constitution.

I say nothing now of precedents from the British Parliament, for they are all more or less inapplicable. We live under a written Constitution, with certain specified powers; and all these are restricted by the Tenth Amendment, declaring that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." But even British precedents have found a critic at home, in the late Chief Justice of England, Lord Denman, pronouncing judgment in the great case of *Stockdale* v. *Hansard*,[1] — and also in the words of an elegant and authoritative historian, whose life has been passed in one or the other of the two Houses of Parliament: I refer to Lord Mahon, now Earl Stanhope, who, in his History of England, thus remarks: —

"I may observe, in passing, that throughout the reign of George the Second the privileges of the House of Commons flourished in the rankest luxuriance. . . . . So long as men in authority are enabled to go beyond the law, on the plea of their own dignity and power, *the* ONLY *limit to their encroachments will be that of the public endurance.*" [2]

[1] 9 Adolphus and Ellis, 1.

[2] Lord Mahon, History of England, Chap. XXXI. Vol. IV. p. 20.

Nothing can be more true than this warning. But Lord Brougham has expressed himself in words yet stronger, and, if possible, still more applicable to the present case.

"All rights," says this consummate orator, "are now utterly disregarded by the advocates of Privilege, excepting that of exposing their own short-sighted impolicy and thoughtless inconsistency. Nor would there be any safety for the people under their guidance, if unhappily their powers of doing mischief bore any proportion to their disregard of what is politic and just."[1]

With these observations I quit this question, anxious only that the recent Usurpation of the Senate may not be drawn into a precedent hereafter.

During Mr. Hyatt's protracted imprisonment, Mr. Sumner visited him constantly, and thus became familiar with the condition of the jail. This led to the introduction of the following resolution, March 13, 1860.

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be directed to consider the expediency of doing something to improve the condition of the common jail of the city of Washington."

Before the vote on the resolution was taken, Mr. Sumner remarked that he had visited the jail, and found it neither more nor less than a mere human sty; and since the Senate had undertaken to send a fellow-creature there, he thought that the least it could do was to see that something was done to improve its condition.

[1] Privilege of Parliament, Introduction: Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham upon Questions relating to Public Rights, Duties, and Interests, Vol. IV. p. 353.

ABOLITION OF CUSTOM-HOUSE OATHS.

RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE, MARCH 15, 1860.

MR. SUMNER submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

RESOLVED, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to consider whether the numerous custom-house oaths, now administered under Acts of Congress, may not with propriety be abolished, and a simple declaration be substituted therefor.

BOSTON COMMON, AND ITS EXTENSION.

LETTER TO GEORGE H. SNELLING, ESQ., OF BOSTON
MARCH 26, 1860.

MR. SNELLING interested himself much with regard to the disposition of the lands west of Boston Common, known as the "Back Bay Lands," and owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Beyond a general desire to keep them open, his special aim was to have a tidal lake, bordered by avenues with trees. In this effort he was aided particularly by John A. Andrew, afterwards Governor. Other citizens, including the venerable Josiah Quincy, Professor Agassiz, and Dr. Edward Jarvis, wrote letters, published at the time, and used before the Committee of the Legislature to whom the matter was referred. Among these was the following.

SENATE CHAMBER, March 26, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — I am grateful for your timely intervention to save our Boston Common, by keeping it open to the western breezes and the setting sun. It is not pleasant, I know, to separate in opinion from those about us; but your object is so disinterested, so pure, so benevolent, so truly in the nature of a charity, that all, even though differing in details, must be glad that you have come forward.

I know well the value of water in scenery. Perhaps nothing else adds so much to the effect of a landscape, which, indeed, without water often seems lifeless, or, as was once said by a valued friend of mine, "like a face without eyes." Boston, from its peninsular situation,

cannot be entirely deprived of this picturesque feature. It seems to me, however, that, in a region like that now in question, we should hesitate long before renouncing the opportunity of adding to its attractions by a piece of water, which, from perennial supply, would always prove an ornament of unsurpassed beauty, as well as a place of recreation, and a source of health.

On this it is useless to enlarge. All who have ever stood on Boston Common will easily see how much this pleasant retreat must lose in charm, when its great western vista is closed; and all who have ever speculated on the probable growth of our metropolis, and the longing of a crowded population for fresh air, will recognize the necessity for open spaces, which will be *outdoor ventilators.*

Boston is already growing in every direction. A wise forecast, if not able at once to provide all the means needful for its salubrity and adornment, will at least avoid embarrassing the future, when half a million of souls have built their homes about the ancient Trimountain.

Our Common has been ample enough for the past; but the metropolis has already outgrown it in every respect. Besides being too narrow in proportions, it is wanting in those accessories of beauty and of knowledge especially illustrative of Natural History, which, according to the experience of other countries, are proper for public grounds. I wish much to see there, among other things, an arboretum, where every tree that can bear our climate shall find its classified place, — pleasing the eye by its beauty, protecting the body by its shade, and speaking to all by the voice of Science.

Accept the thanks of an absent citizen, who never thinks of his native Boston without a yearning to see it foremost in all that contributes to a true civilization; and believe me to be, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

To GEORGE H. SNELLING, Esq.

ATTEMPT TO KIDNAP A CITIZEN UNDER ORDER OF THE SENATE.

THE CASE OF FRANK B. SANBORN, OF CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS, WITH SPEECHES IN THE SENATE, APRIL 10, 13, AND 16, 1860.

THE case of Mr. Sanborn illustrates the reach of the Slave Power, and the extent to which the Senate did its bidding, at the instance of the author of the Fugitive Slave Bill. It is one of the skirmishes in the warfare with Slavery.

April 10, 1860, Mr. Sumner presented the memorial of Mr. Sanborn, which he explained as follows.

I HAVE a memorial, Mr. President, from Frank B. Sanborn, of Concord, Massachusetts, setting forth a gross attempt to kidnap, by men pretending to act in the name of the Senate of the United States. The memorial is authenticated by his affidavit before a notary public. It sets forth, that, on the evening of the 3d of April, certain persons, who had been prowling about his neighborhood, under shelter of night, with fraudulent pretence drew him to his door, seized him, handcuffed him, and then by force undertook to convey him to a carriage. By the courageous interposition of a refined lady, his sister, neighbors were aroused; the village was next summoned by the ringing of bells, and at length that great friend of the oppressed in our country, the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, arrived on the ground. By intervention of that writ he was taken from the custody of the kidnappers. The next day a

hearing was had before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts; and Chief Justice Shaw, for thirty years the honored Chief Justice of Massachusetts, whose opinions are respected in every part of the country, representing the full bench, without undertaking to pass upon the question of jurisdiction in the Senate, went on to declare that the power delegated to its Sergeant-at-Arms could not be delegated to another, and that therefore all these proceedings were void, and the prisoner was discharged.

Now, Mr. President, this act, it seems to me, is conspicuous, both from the person against whom it was directed and the place where it was attempted. It was directed against Mr. Sanborn, a quiet citizen engaged in the instruction of youth, a scholar of excellent attainments, of perfect purity, and much beloved by friends and neighbors. It was attempted at Concord, where another seizure was once attempted, which began that revolutionary contest that ended in Independence. I affirm, Mr. President, that a person like Mr. Sanborn, having suffered this outrage at the hands of persons claiming to act in the name of the Senate, has a right to redress in this body: and I assert, still further, that this body owes something to its own character; it ought to wash its hands of such an outrage. I offer his memorial, and ask its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, that the Senate may better understand it, I think it ought to be printed. I move also its printing.

Mr. Mason, of Virginia, Chairman of the Harper's Ferry Committee, made an explanation of the attempt to arrest Mr. Sanborn, in the course of which he said: "This man Sanborn was in correspondence either with the man who was not long since hung in Virginia for his

conduct as a traitor and murderer at Harper's Ferry, or with some of his associates, I do not recollect which." At the call of Mr. Fessenden the memorial was read, when Mr. Sumner said, in reply to Mr. Mason: —

I merely wish to correct one error into which the Senator has fallen. He states that Mr. Sanborn was taken from the custody of those pretended officers by a mob. Now nothing is within my knowledge except what is authenticated by that memorial under oath, and there the statement is express that he was not taken from the custody of these pretended officers except by the intervention of the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, sustained by the *posse comitatus* of the neighborhood.

Mr. Mason having stated that he expected a return of the officer, at his suggestion the memorial was laid on the table to await that return. To this Mr. Sumner consented, as he declared, with great reluctance, and with the understanding that then it should be referred.

April 13, 1860, Mr. Sumner presented additional papers in the case. After reading these, he said: —

There, Sir, is the official response to the assertion of the Senator from Virginia. The Senator says that Mr. Sanborn was rescued by a mob. It is true there was a mob in Concord. It was a mob of kidnappers, who went there in the name of the Senate of the United States to seize a citizen of Massachusetts. I have here a letter which I have received from a prominent citizen of Concord, present at the time. This is his statement: —

"No rescue by the crowd was made or attempted, till the writ of *Habeas Corpus* was served; and this, even, Carleton and his fellows resisted, till the deputy sheriff was obliged to use force to take Mr. Sanborn from him. . . . . The arrest was as brutal, cowardly, and outrageous a proceed-

ing as I ever knew in seven years' experience as sheriff of that county."

Sir, it is not unnatural that an arrest made under such circumstances should have attracted attention in that town and throughout Massachusetts. It did so. It has excited a feeling of indignation against this attempt, increased, perhaps, when people put the question, "Why all this effort to seize Mr. Sanborn? Why this overthrow of law to accomplish such a purpose?"

It is notorious that there is a citizen of Virginia, formerly chief magistrate of that State, who has openly avowed that he knew much in regard to the very matters in inquiry before that committee, and that rubies could not bribe him to disclose it. He has thrown the challenge down to that committee and this Senate, before the whole country, refusing openly to testify; and yet that committee make no motion to bring Ex-Governor Wise before the Senate, and compel him to testify. Instead, the committee seeks a Northern man, Mr. Hyatt, now in jail, and another Northern man, Mr. Sanborn, who it is well understood know nothing of the matter; and it follows up Mr. Sanborn by an attempt which I characterize here as simply an act of kidnapping.

Mr. Mason, in reply, insisted, at some length, that Mr. Sumner could have no information on the action of the committee, which had not yet reported. To this Mr. Sumner rejoined: —

Mr. President, I profess to have no information except what is open to all the world; and there are two things open to all the world, through the public press: first, that the Ex-Governor of Virginia has more than once declared that he had important information in

reference to the matter before the committee, and that rubies would not tempt him to disclose it; and, secondly, it is known that the Ex-Governor of Virginia has not been brought to Washington, as Mr. Hyatt has been, and as an attempt has been made to bring Mr. Sanborn. No kidnappers have been sent into Virginia, nor handcuffs put upon Ex-Governor Wise.

April 16, 1860, Mr. Mason presented to the Senate the warrant for the arrest of Mr. Sanborn, with the return of the Deputy Marshal of Massachusetts to whom it was addressed, and moved its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to inquire and report whether any, and what, further proceedings were necessary to vindicate the authority of the Senate and to effect the arrest of the witnesses. This motion was agreed to. Mr. Sumner then moved that the memorial of Mr. Sanborn, with the additional papers, be taken from the table and referred to the same committee. Here Mr. Mason promptly interposed the very unusual motion *that the memorial be rejected.* The Chair decided that the motion "to reject" could not take precedence, and therefore the motion to refer was first in order. Then it was that Mr. Sumner spoke as follows.

Mr. President, I think that I ought not to listen to such a proposition as has been made by the Senator from Virginia with reference to this memorial, without one word in reply. Here is a memorial from a gentleman of perfect respectability, charged with no crime, presumed to be innocent, complaining of gross outrage at the hands of certain persons pretending to act in the name of the Senate. The facts are duly set forth. They are authenticated also by documents now of record. The Senator moves — without any reference to a committee, without giving the petition the decency of a hearing, according to the ordinary forms of this body — that the memorial be "rejected"; and he makes this unaccustomed motion with a view to establish a prece-

dent in such a case. I feel it my duty to establish a precedent also in this case, by entering an open, unequivocal protest against such attempt. Sir, an ancient poet said of a judge in hell, that he punished first and heard afterwards, — "*castigatque auditque*"; and, permit me to say, the Senator from Virginia, on this occasion, takes a precedent from that court.

To this protest Mr. Mason replied: "The Senator from Massachusetts, it seems to me, makes an opportunity to use language in the Senate Chamber which, so far as my intercourse with the world goes, is not usual out of the Senate Chamber. There is nothing in it that I have a right to take as personally offensive to myself. The Senate is the proper judge and arbiter of the decorum of its own proceedings."

Then ensued a debate on the return, in which Mr. Bayard, of Delaware, and Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, took part, when Mr. Sumner, at last obtaining the floor, remarked as follows.

Only one word. I presented a memorial to this body, setting forth an outrage. The Senator from Virginia moved its rejection, while he proposed that the case should be proceeded with. I characterized that motion as I thought I was authorized to do, referring to a precedent of antiquity, and that was all; and this is the occasion for a lecture from the Senator on the manner in which one should conduct on this floor. From the heights of his self-confidence he addresses me. Sir, I wish to say simply, in reply, that, when an outrage comes before this body, I shall denounce it in plain terms; and if a precedent from a very bad place seems to be in point, I shall not hesitate to quote it.

Mr. Mason rejoined: "I did not undertake to lecture the Senator, of all others, upon the subject of manners or propriety. I do not mean it offensively, but, for my own convenience, I should consider it time thrown away. All that I said was, that I was not accustomed, in my intercourse with the world outside of this Chamber, to hear language of that sort in the circles in which I move."

April 17, 1860, the memorial of Mr. Sanborn was referred to the Judiciary Committee, according to the motion of Mr. Sumner.

June 7, Mr. Bayard, of Delaware, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the return of the Deputy-Marshal and the other papers, reported a "Bill concerning the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives," authorizing the appointment of deputies. This was intended to meet the decision of Chief Justice Shaw, of Massachusetts.[1]

June 15, Mr. Bayard moved to proceed with the consideration of his bill. The motion was not agreed to, — there being, on a division, ayes 22, noes 25. This was the end of that bill.

This incident was much noticed by the Northern press, especially in Massachusetts. The Boston *Atlas and Bee* expressed itself thus : —

"In our opinion the people of the Free States are never better satisfied with their representatives than when they see them repelling indignantly and manfully the arrogant insults of the slave-driving aristocracy. It will not diminish their attachment to Mr. Sumner, when they take notice that his rebuke of Mr. Mason was not in reply to any insult upon himself, but upon one of his outraged and abused constituents."

[1] Sanborn *v.* Carleton, 15 Gray, 399.

PETITIONS AGAINST SLAVERY.

Speech in the Senate, April 18, 1860.

The treatment of these petitions illustrates the tyranny of the Slave Power to the very eve of its fall. Such an incident is not without historic significance.

MR. PRESIDENT,—I present the petition of Henry Elwell, Jr., and four hundred and fifty-five others, of Manchester, in Massachusetts, earnestly petitioning Congress to repeal the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, — to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the United States Territories, — to prohibit the inter-State slave-trade, — and to pass a resolution pledging Congress against the admission of any Slave State into the Union, the acquisition of any Slave Territory, and the employment of any slaves by any agent, contractor, officer, or department of the National Government; also, a like petition of Alvan Howes and fifty-five others, of Barnstable, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of John Clement and one hundred and nineteen others, of Townsend, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Samuel L. Rockwood and seventy-three others, of Weymouth, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of J. H. Browne and sixty-four others, of Sudbury, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Daniel Hosmer and ninety-eight others, of Sterling, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Al-

bert Gould and one hundred and thirty-one others of Leicester, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of James M. Evelett and two hundred others, of Princeton, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Daniel Otis and seventy-nine others, of South Scituate, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Calvin Cutter and eighty-four others, of Warren, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of R. W. French and thirty others, of Lawrence, Massachusetts; also, a like petition of Edmund H. Sears and two hundred and forty-five others, of Wayland, Massachusetts.

These several petitions I now present. On a former occasion, during this session, a similar petition presented by me was laid upon the table. A similar petition presented by another Senator was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. An authoritative precedent, established after debate, since I have been in the Senate, seems to be the best guide on this occasion. That was on a memorial from four thousand citizens of Boston, praying the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act. After ample consideration, during which much was said against the memorialists, no proposition was made to lay their prayer on the table. Following that precedent, and another established during the present session, I move that all these petitions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Mason, of Virginia, at once moved that the petitions lie on the table, thus precluding debate and stifling action. The yeas and nays were ordered on motion of Mr. Sumner, and resulted as follows, 25 yeas and 19 nays: —

Yeas, — Messrs. Bayard, Bragg, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Crittenden, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Gwin, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, La-

tham, Mason, Nicholson, Polk, Rice, Sebastian, Slidell, and Thomson, — 25.

NAYS, — Messrs. Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, King, Seward, Sumner, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson, — 19.

So the petitions were ordered to lie on the table. The Democrats all voted yea; the Republicans all voted nay.

SAFETY OF PASSENGERS IN STEAMSHIPS FOR CALIFORNIA.

RESOLUTION AND REMARKS IN THE SENATE, MAY 21, 1860.

MAY 21, 1860, Mr. Sumner introduced the following resolution.

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to consider the expediency of further action, in order to secure proper accommodations and proper safety for passengers on board the steamers between New York and San Francisco, and to increase the efficacy of the existing passenger laws of the United States in their application to California passengers; with liberty to report by bill or otherwise."

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I see the Senator from California [Mr. LATHAM] in his place, and I very gladly take the opportunity of calling his attention particularly to the resolution which I now have the honor to offer. By a communication in the newspapers, from a distinguished source, — a clergyman, who, during the last two months, sailed from Boston to San Francisco,[1] — it appears that the steamers are overloaded with passengers, and without adequate accommodations of other kinds for safety. His statement on the subject is explicit, and has been made in the newspapers, as also in private letters to his friends. I do not know that the evil can be reached by any additional legisla-

[1] Rev. Thomas Starr King.

tion; perhaps no additional legislation is needed; but it is an evil which should be remedied in some way, or else we shall be startled some morning by the news of a great calamity, — the loss of one of these steamers, with, it may be, a thousand passengers.

CANDIDATES WHO ARE A PLATFORM.

LETTER TO A RATIFICATION MEETING AT BUFFALO, NEW YORK, MAY 30, 1860.

THIS was addressed to a meeting at Buffalo for the ratification of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln as President and Hannibal Hamlin as Vice-President.

SENATE CHAMBER, May 30, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — My duties here will not allow me to be with you at Buffalo; but I shall unite with you in every generous word uttered for Freedom, and in every pledge of enthusiastic support to the Republican candidates.

We have a Platform of noble principles, and candidates, each of whom, through his well-known principles and integrity of character, is a Platform in himself.

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

A. W. HARVEY, ESQ.

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE BILL FOR THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS AS A FREE STATE, JUNE 4, 1860.

Thou art a slave, whom Fortune's tender arm
With favor never clasped, but bred a dog.
SHAKESPEARE, *Timon of Athens*, Act IV. Sc. 3.

A universe of death, which God by curse
Created evil, for evil only good,
Where all life dies, death lives, and Nature breeds,
Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things.
MILTON, *Paradise Lost*, Book II. 622 - 625.

Onward! onward!
With the night-wind,
Over field and farm and forest,
Lonely homestead, darksome hamlet,
Blighting all we breathe upon!
LONGFELLOW, *Golden Legend.*

Instrumenti genus vocale, et semivocale, et mutum: *vocale, in quo sunt servi;* semivocale, in quo sunt boves; mutum, in quo sunt plaustra. — VARRO, *De Re Rustica*, Lib. I. cap. xvii. § 1.

Nil metuunt jurare, nihil promittere parcunt;
Dicta nihil metuere, nihil perjuria curant.

CATULLUS, *Carm.* LXIV. 146, 148.

Pone crucem servo. — Meruit quo crimine servus
Supplicium? quis testis adest? quis detulit? Audi:
Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est. —
O demens, ita servus homo est? Nil fecerit, esto:
Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.

JUVENAL, *Sat.* VI. 219–223.

There is a tradition of the Prophet having said, that the greatest mortification at the Day of Judgment will be when the pious slave is carried to Paradise and the wicked master condemned to Hell. — SAADI, *The Gulistan*, tr. Gladwin, p. 242.

"And the Black Oppressor am I called. And for this reason I am called the Black Oppressor, that there is not a single man around me whom I have not oppressed, and justice have I done unto none." . . . . "Since thou hast, indeed, been an oppressor so long," said Peredur, "I will cause that thou continue so no longer." So he slew him. — *The Mabinogion*, tr. Lady Charlotte Guest, Vol. I. pp. 341, 342.

After we had secured these people, I called the linguists, and ordered them to bid the men-negroes between decks be quiet (for there was a great noise amongst them). On their being silent, I asked, What had induced them to mutiny? They answered, *I was a great rogue to buy them* in order to carry them away from their own country, and that they were resolved to regain their liberty, if possible. — SNELGRAVE, *New Account of some Parts of Guinea and the Slave-Trade*, p. 170.

A system of concubinage was practised among them worse than the loose polygamy of the savages: the savage had as many women as consented to become his wives; the colonist as many as he could enslave. There is an ineffaceable stigma upon the Europeans in their intercourse with those whom they treat as inferior races; there is a perpetual contradiction between their lust and their avarice. The planter will one day take a slave for his harlot, and sell her the next as a being of some lower species, a beast of labor. If she be indeed an inferior animal, what shall be said of the one action? If she be equally with himself a human being and an immortal soul, what shall be said of the other? Either way there is a crime committed against human nature. — SOUTHEY, *History of Brazil*, Chap. VIII., Vol. I. p. 258.

Negro slavery exists in no part of the world without producing indolence, licentiousness, and inhumanity in the whites; and these vices draw after them their earthly punishment, — to look no farther into their fearful, but assured consequences. — IBID., Chap. XLIV., Vol. III. p. 816.

I had observed much, and heard more, of the cruelty of masters towards their negroes; but now I received an authentic account of some horrid instances thereof. The giving a child a slave of its own age to tyrannize over, to beat and abuse out of sport, was, I myself saw, a common practice. Nor is it strange, being thus trained up in cruelty, they should after-

wards arrive at so great perfection in it; that Mr. Star, a gentleman I often met at Mr. Lasserre's, should, as he himself informed L., first nail up a negro by the ears, then order him to be whipped in the severest manner, and then to have scalding water thrown over him, so that the poor creature could not stir for four months after. Another much applauded punishment is drawing their slaves' teeth. One Colonel LYNCH is universally known to have cut off a poor negro's legs, and to kill several of them every year by his barbarities. — REV. CHARLES WESLEY, *Journal*, Charleston, S. C., August 2, 1736.

You are to have no regard to the health, strength, comfort, natural affections, or moral feelings, or intellectual endowments of my negroes. You are only to consider what subsistence to allow them and what labor to exact of them will subserve my interest. According to the most accurate calculation I can make, the proportion of subsistence and labor which will work them up in six years upon an average is the most profitable to the planter. And this allowance, surely, is very humane; for we estimate here the lives of our coal-heavers, upon an average, at only two years, ... and our soldiers and seamen no matter what. — *A West-India Planter's Instructions for his Overseers:* JOHN ADAMS, *Works*, Vol. X. pp. 339, 340.

The unfortunate man would have been tried upon five other indictments, some of them still more atrocious than the one upon which he was found guilty; and his general character for barbarity was so notorious that no room was left for me even to deliberate. His victims have been numerous: some of them were even buried in their chains, and there have been found upon the bones taken from the grave chains and iron rings of near forty pounds' weight. . . . . He had been three times married, has left several children; he had been in the Army, had a liberal education, and lived in what is called the great world. His manners and address were those of a gentleman. Cruelty appears in him to have been the effect of violence of temper, *and habit had made him regardless of the death and suffering of a slave.* — RIGHT HON. HUGH ELLIOT, Governor of the Leeward Islands: *Memoir*, by the COUNTESS OF MINTO, pp. 409, 410.

Is slavery less slavery in a Christian than in a Mahometan country? I entreat your attention, while I plead the general cause of humanity. In such a cause it is right to appeal to your sensibility as well as your reason. It is now no longer time to flatter petty tyrants by acknowledging that color constitutes a legitimate title for holding men in abject and perpetual bondage. In support of this usurpation what can be urged but the law of the strongest? — COL. DAVID HUMPHREYS, *Valedictory Discourse before the Cincinnati of Connecticut*, July 4, 1804, p. 29.

Christianity suppressed slavery, but the Christians of the sixteenth century reëstablished it, — as an exception, indeed, to their social system, and restricted to one of the races of mankind; but the wound thus inflicted

upon humanity, though less extensive, was far more difficult of cure. — TOCQUEVILLE, *Democracy in America*, ed. Bowen, Chap. XVIII. sec. 2, Vol. I. p. 457.

The Kentuckian delights in violent bodily exertion; he is familiar with the use of arms, and is accustomed from a very early age to expose his life in single combat. . . . . Were I inclined to continue this parallel, I could easily prove that almost all the differences which may be remarked between the characters of the Americans in the Southern and in the Northern States have originated in Slavery. — IBID., pp. 467, 468.

I visited our State Penitentiary a short time since, and from my own personal observation I am led to the inevitable conclusion that the plan of sending our slaves to the Penitentiary, as a *punishment* for crime, is exactly the reverse: it is rather a reward than punishment. "Let sober reason judge."

We punish offenders to prevent crime. I would ask any reasonable man, Is the sending a slave of any of our farms to the Penitentiary a punishment? The white man is punished by being deprived of his liberty for that length of time: what liberty is the slave deprived of? He has as much, and oftentimes *more*, liberty within the walls of the Penitentiary than on any of those large sugar or cotton plantations. Then where is the punishment? We send white men there, and the dread of going is a *stain* on his character: what character has the negro to lose? Hence we must come to the conclusion that sending negro slaves to the Penitentiary is not a punishment.

A moment's reflection will convince any man who has ever had the management of negroes on a plantation, that the well-being and safety of societies demand that any offence committed by a negro, for which the *lash* is not a sufficient punishment, *death* should be the penalty.

Taking these things into consideration, would it not be just and laudable to sell all negroes now in the Penitentiary to the highest bidder, on or about the first of November next, by the Sheriff of the Parish of East Baton Rouge, on the same terms and conditions that negroes are sold at present, under an ordinary *fi. fa.*, and, as near as can be, two thirds of the net proceeds of each negro be paid to the former owners or their legal representatives, the balance be and remain in the State Treasury for ordinary purposes? — *Weekly Advocate*, Baton Rouge, La., Jan. 17, 1858.

A VERY large edition of this speech was printed at Washington, immediately after its delivery. Another appeared at Boston, with a portrait; and another at San Francisco, with the Republican Platform. While the Rebellion was still warring on the National Government, an edition was brought out in New York by the "Young Men's Republican Union," to which Mr. Sumner prefixed a Dedication to the Young Men of the United States, which will be found in its proper place, according to date, in this collection.

A letter from that devoted friend of the Slave, the late George L. Stearns, of Boston, under date of March 1st, 1860, shows something of the outside prompting under which Mr. Sumner spoke.

"I have just read ———'s speech. He stands up to the mark *well*, for a politician; but we want one who believes a Man is greater than a President, and who would not lift his finger to obtain the best office in the gift of our nation, to raise this question above the political slough into its true position. Charles O'Conor, in his late speech in New York, affirmed, that, 'if Slavery were not a wise and beneficent institution for the black as well as the white, it could not be defended.' We want you to take up the gauntlet that he has thrown down so defiantly."

A letter from William H. Brooks, of Cambridgeport, unconsciously harmonized with Mr. Stearns.

"Feeling that our nation is now in the very throes of her deliverance, and I trust her prompt deliverance, from bondage to her, not Thirty, but Three Hundred Thousand Tyrants, may I frankly say, that, if not inconsistent with your health and safety, which are on no consideration to be perilled, you could aid more than any single person, or score of them, in effectually accomplishing the great triumph. . . . . The unseen forces of public opinion are gathering and forming for the great November conflict. Your long, enforced, and martyr silence will give a depth of impression and moving power and ten thousand echoes to your words beyond their accustomed might."

Something about the menace of violence after this speech, with illustrations of its reception at the time, is postponed to an Appendix.

Kansas was not admitted as a State into the Union until January 29, 1861, after the slaveholding Senators had withdrawn to organize the Rebellion, when the bill on which the present speech was made became a law.

SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT, — Undertaking now, after a silence of more than four years, to address the Senate on this important subject, I should suppress the emotions natural to such an occasion, if I did not declare on the threshold my gratitude to that Supreme Being through whose benign care I am enabled, after much suffering and many changes, once again to resume my duties here, and to speak for the cause so near my heart. To the honored Commonwealth whose representative I am, and also to my immediate associates in this body, with whom I enjoy the fellowship which is found *in thinking alike concerning the Republic*,[1] I owe thanks which I seize the moment to express for indulgence extended to me throughout the protracted seclusion enjoined by medical skill; and I trust that it will not be thought unbecoming in me to put on record here, as an apology for leaving my seat so long vacant, without making way, by resignation, for a successor, that I acted under the illusion of an invalid, whose hopes for restoration to natural health continued against oft-recurring disappointment.

When last I entered into this debate, it became my duty to expose the Crime against Kansas, and to insist

[1] "Eadem de Republica sensisse." — CIC., *Orat. in Pisonem*, c. 32.

upon the immediate admission of that Territory as a State of this Union, with a Constitution forbidding Slavery. Time has passed, but the question remains. Resuming the discussion precisely where I left it, I am happy to avow that rule of moderation which, it is said, may venture to fix the boundaries of wisdom itself. I have no personal griefs to utter: only a vulgar egotism could intrude such into this Chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge: only a brutish nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened and the tombs that have opened[1] since I spoke have their voices, too, which I cannot fail to hear. Besides, what am I, what is any man among the living or among the dead, compared with the question before us? It is this alone which I shall discuss, and I begin the argument with that easy victory which is found in charity.

The Crime against Kansas stands forth in painful light. Search history, and you cannot find its parallel. The slave-trade is bad; but even this enormity is petty, compared with that elaborate contrivance by which, in a Christian age and within the limits of a Republic, all forms of constitutional liberty were perverted, all the rights of human nature violated, and the whole country held trembling on the edge of civil war, — while all this large exuberance of wickedness, detestable in itself, becomes tenfold more detestable, when its origin is traced to the madness for Slavery. The fatal partition between Freedom and Slavery, known as the Missouri Compromise, — the subsequent overthrow of this partition, and the seizure of all by Slavery, — the violation of plighted

[1] Mr. Brooks and Senator Butler were both dead.

faith, — the conspiracy to force Slavery at all hazards into Kansas, — the successive invasions by which all security there was destroyed, and the electoral franchise itself was trodden down, — the sacrilegious seizure of the very polls, and, through pretended forms of law, the imposition of a foreign legislature upon this Territory, — the acts of this legislature, fortifying the Usurpation, and, among other things, establishing test-oaths, calculated to disfranchise actual settlers friendly to Freedom, and securing the privileges of the citizen to actual strangers friendly to Slavery, — the whole crowned by a statute, "the be-all and the end-all" of the whole Usurpation, through which Slavery was not only recognized on this beautiful soil, but made to bristle with a Code of Death such as the world has rarely seen, — all these I fully exposed on a former occasion. And yet the most important part of the argument was at that time left untouched: I mean that found in the Character of Slavery. This natural sequel, with the permission of the Senate, I now propose to supply.

Motive is to Crime as soul to body; and it is only when we comprehend the motive that we can truly comprehend the Crime. Here the motive is found in Slavery and the rage for its extension. Therefore, by logical necessity, must Slavery be discussed, — not indirectly, timidly, and sparingly, but directly, openly, and thoroughly. It must be exhibited as it is, alike in its influence and its animating character, so that not only outside, but inside, may be seen.

This is no time for soft words or excuses. All such are out of place. They may turn away wrath; but what is the wrath of man? This is no time to abandon any advantage in the argument. Senators some-

times announce that they resist Slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds, but on all other grounds, whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any strife of rival factions, of White and Red Roses, of theatric Neri and Bianchi; but it is a solemn battle between Right and Wrong, between Good and Evil. Such a battle cannot be fought with rosewater. There is austere work to be done, and Freedom cannot consent to fling away any of her weapons.

If I were disposed to shrink from this discussion, the boundless assumptions made by Senators on the other side would not allow me. The whole character of Slavery, as a pretended form of Civilization, is put directly in issue, with a pertinacity and a hardihood which banish all reserve on this side. In these assumptions Senators from South Carolina naturally take the lead. Following Mr. Calhoun, who pronounced Slavery "the most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions,"[1] and Mr. McDuffie, who did not shrink from calling it "the corner-stone of our republican edifice,"[2] the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] insists that its "frame of society is the best in the world"[3]; and his colleague [Mr. CHESNUT] takes up the strain. One Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS], adds, that Slavery

[1] Speech in the Senate, February 6, 1837: Works, Vol. II. p. 632. See Miscellaneous Writings on Slavery, by William Jay, p. 509.

[2] Message to the Legislature of South Carolina, November, 1835.

[3] Speech in the Senate, March 4, 1858: Congressional Globe, 35th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 961.

"is but a form of civil government for those who by their nature are not fit to govern themselves";[1] and his colleague [Mr. BROWN] openly vaunts that it "is a great moral, social, and political blessing, — a blessing to the slave, and a blessing to the master."[2] One Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTER], in a studied vindication of what he is pleased to call "the social system of the South," exalts Slavery as "the normal condition of human society," "beneficial to the non-slave-owner as it is to the slave-owner," "best for the happiness of both races," — and, in enthusiastic advocacy, declares, "that the very keystone of the mighty arch, which, by its concentrated strength, and by the mutual support of its parts, is able to sustain our social superstructure, consists in the black marble block of African Slavery: knock that out, and the mighty fabric, with all that it upholds, topples and tumbles to its fall."[3] These are his very words, uttered in debate here. And his colleague [Mr. MASON], who never hesitates where Slavery is in question, proclaims that it is "*ennobling* to both races, the white and the black," — a word which, so far as the slave is concerned, he changes, on a subsequent day, to "elevating," assuming still that it is "ennobling" to the whites,[4] — which is simply a new version of the old assumption, by Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, that "the institution of Domestic Slavery supersedes the necessity of an order of nobility."[5]

[1] Speech in the Senate, February 29, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 917.

[2] Speech in the Senate, March 6, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 1004.

[3] Speech in the Senate, January 31, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, pp. 104–109.

[4] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., pp. 557, 596: January 23, 26, 1860.

[5] Message to the Legislature of South Carolina, November, 1835.

Thus, by various voices, is Slavery defiantly proclaimed a form of Civilization, — not seeing that its existence is plainly inconsistent with the first principles of anything that can be called Civilization, except by that figure of speech in classical literature where a thing takes its name from something which it has not, as the dreadful Fates were called merciful because they were without mercy. Pardon the allusion, if I add, that, listening to these sounding words for Slavery, I am reminded of the kindred extravagance related by that remarkable traveller in China, the late Abbé Huc, where a gloomy hole in which he was lodged, infested by mosquitoes and exhaling noisome vapors, with light and air entering by a single narrow aperture only, was styled by Chinese pride "The Hotel of the Beatitudes." According to a Hindoo proverb, the snail sees nothing but its own shell, and thinks it the grandest palace in the universe. This is another illustration of the delusion which we are called to witness.

It is natural that Senators thus insensible to the true character of Slavery should evince an equal insensibility to the true character of the Constitution. This is shown in the claim now made, and pressed with unprecedented energy, degrading the work of our fathers, that by virtue of the Constitution the pretended property in man is placed beyond the reach of Congressional prohibition even within Congressional jurisdiction, so that the slave-master may at all times enter the broad outlying territories of the Union with the victims of his oppression, and there continue to hold them by lash and chain.

Such are two assumptions, the first of fact, and the second of Constitutional Law, now vaunted without

apology or hesitation. I meet them both. To the first I oppose the essential Barbarism of Slavery, in all its influences, whether high or low, — as Satan is Satan still, whether towering in the sky or squatting in the toad. To the second I oppose the unanswerable, irresistible truth, that the Constitution of the United States nowhere recognizes property in man. These two assumptions naturally go together. They are "twins" suckled by the same wolf. They are the "couple" in the present slave-hunt. And the latter cannot be answered without exposing the former. It is only when Slavery is exhibited in its truly hateful character that we fully appreciate the absurdity of the assumption, which, in defiance of express letter in the Constitution, and without a single sentence, phrase, or word upholding human bondage, yet foists into this blameless text the barbarous idea that man can hold property in man.

On former occasions I have discussed Slavery only incidentally: as, in unfolding the principle that Slavery is Sectional and Freedom National; in exposing the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Bill; in vindicating the Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory; in exhibiting the imbecility, throughout the Revolution, of the Slave States, and especially of South Carolina; and, lastly, in unmasking the Crime against Kansas. On all these occasions, where I spoke at length, I said too little of the character of Slavery, — partly because other topics were presented, and partly from a prevailing disinclination to press the argument against those whom I knew to have all the sensitiveness of a sick man. But, God be praised, this time has passed, and the debate is now lifted from details to principles. Grander debate has not occurred in our

history, — rarely in any history; nor can it close or subside, except with the triumph of Freedom.

First Assumption.

Of course I begin with the assumption of fact, which must be treated at length.

It was the often-quoted remark of John Wesley, who knew well how to use words, as also how to touch hearts, that Slavery is "the sum of all villanies." The phrase is pungent; but it were rash in any of us to criticise the testimony of that illustrious founder of Methodism, whose ample experience of Slavery in Georgia and the Carolinas seems to have been all condensed in this sententious judgment. Language is feeble to express all the enormity of an institution which is now exalted as in itself a form of civilization, "ennobling" at least to the master, if not to the slave. Look at it as you will, and it is always the scab, the canker, the "barebones," and the shame of the country, — wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apologist, but wrong in the concrete also, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principle, and it is nothing less than a huge insurrection against the eternal law of God, involving in its pretensions the denial of all human rights, and also the denial of that Divine Law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically the grossest lie and the grossest atheism. Founded in violence, sustained only by violence, such a wrong must by sure law of compensation blast master as well as slave, — blast the lands on which they live, blast the community of which they are part, blast the govern-

ment which does not forbid the outrage; and the longer it exists and the more completely it prevails, must its vengeful influences penetrate the whole social system. Barbarous in origin, barbarous in law, barbarous in all its pretensions, barbarous in the instruments it employs, barbarous in consequences, barbarous in spirit, barbarous wherever it shows itself, Slavery must breed Barbarians, while it develops everywhere, alike in the individual and the society to which he belongs, the essential elements of Barbarism. In this character it is conspicuous before the world.

Undertaking now to expose the BARBARISM OF SLAVERY, the whole broad field is open before me. There is nothing in its character, its manifold wrong, its wretched results, and especially in its influence on the class claiming to be "ennobled" by it, that will not fall naturally under consideration.

I know well the difficulty of this discussion, involved in the humiliating truth with which I begin. Senators, on former occasions, revealing their sensitiveness, have even protested against comparison between what were called "two civilizations," — meaning the two social systems produced respectively by Freedom and Slavery. The sensibility and the protest are not unnatural, though mistaken. "Two civilizations!" Sir, in this nineteenth century of Christian light there can be but one Civilization, and this is where Freedom prevails. Between Slavery and Civilization there is essential incompatibility. If you are for the one, you cannot be for the other; and just in proportion to the embrace of Slavery is the divorce from Civilization. As cold is but the absence of heat, and darkness but the absence of light, so is Slavery but the absence of

justice and humanity, without which Civilization is impossible. That slave-masters should be disturbed, when this is exposed, might be expected. But the assumptions so boastfully made, while they may not prevent the sensibility, yet surely exclude all ground of protest, when these assumptions are exposed.

Nor is this the only difficulty. Slavery is a bloody Touch-Me-Not, and everywhere in sight now blooms the bloody flower. It is on the wayside as we approach the National Capitol; it is on the marble steps which we mount; it flaunts on this floor. I stand now in the house of its friends. About me, while I speak, are its most jealous guardians, who have shown in the past how much they are ready to do or not to do, where Slavery is in question. Menaces to deter me have not been spared. But I should ill deserve the high post of duty here, with which I am honored by a generous and enlightened people, if I could hesitate. Idolatry has been exposed in the presence of idolaters, and hypocrisy chastised in the presence of Scribes and Pharisees. Such examples may impart encouragement to a Senator undertaking in this presence to expose Slavery; nor can any language, directly responsive to Senatorial assumptions made for this Barbarism, be open to question. Slavery can be painted only in sternest colors; nor can I forget that Nature's sternest painter has been called the best.

THE BARBARISM OF SLAVERY appears, *first*, in the *character of Slavery*, and, *secondly*, in the *character of Slave-Masters*.

Under the first head we shall properly consider (1) the Law of Slavery with its Origin, and (2) the prac-

tical results of Slavery, as shown in comparison between the Free States and the Slave States.

Under the *second* head we shall naturally consider (1) Slave-Masters as shown in the Law of Slavery; (2) Slave-Masters in their relations with slaves, here glancing at their three brutal instruments; (3) Slave-Masters in their relations with each other, with society, and with Government; and (4) Slave-Masters in their unconsciousness.

The way will then be prepared for the consideration of the assumption of Constitutional Law.

I.

In presenting the Character of Slavery, there is little for me, except to make Slavery paint itself. When this is done, the picture will need no explanatory words.

(1.) I begin with the *Law of Slavery and its Origin;* and here this Barbarism sketches itself in its own chosen definition. It is simply this: Man, created in the image of God, is divested of the human character, and declared to be a "chattel," — that is, a beast, a thing, or article of property. That this statement may not seem made without precise authority, I quote the statutes of three different States, beginning with South Carolina, whose voice for Slavery has always unerring distinctiveness. According to the definition supplied by this State, slaves

"shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and as-

signs, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." [1]

And here is the definition supplied by the Civil Code of Louisiana: —

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." [2]

In similar spirit the law of Maryland thus indirectly defines a slave as an *article*: —

"In case the personal property of a ward shall consist of specific *articles*, *such as slaves*, working beasts, animals of any kind, ... the court, if it shall deem it advantageous for the ward, may at any time pass an order for the sale thereof." [3]

Not to occupy time unnecessarily, I present a summary of the pretended law defining Slavery in all the Slave States, as made by a careful writer, Judge Stroud, in a work of juridical as well as philanthropic merit: —

"The cardinal principle of Slavery — that the slave is not to be ranked among *sentient* beings, but among *things*, is an article of property, a chattel personal — obtains as undoubted law in all of these [Slave] States." [4]

Out of this definition, as from a solitary germ, which in its pettiness might be crushed by the hand, towers our Upas Tree and all its gigantic poison. Study it, and you will comprehend the whole monstrous growth.

Sir, look at its plain import, and see the relation which it establishes. The slave is held simply *for the*

[1] Statutes at Large of South Carolina, Vol. VII. p. 397, Act No. 670, sec. 1.
[2] Civil Code, Art. 35.
[3] Laws of Maryland, Acts of 1798, Ch. CI. xii. 12.
[4] Stroud, Law relating to Slavery, pp. 22, 23.

use of his master, to whose behests his life, liberty, and happiness are devoted, and by whom he may be bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped as cargo, stored as goods, sold on execution, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming-table on the hazard of a card or a die, — all according to law. Nor is there anything, within the limit of life, inflicted on a beast, which may not be inflicted on the slave. He may be marked like a hog, branded like a mule, yoked like an ox, hobbled like a horse, driven like an ass, sheared like a sheep, maimed like a cur, and constantly beaten like a brute, — all according to law. And should life itself be taken, what is the remedy? The Law of Slavery, imitating that rule of evidence which in barbarous days and barbarous countries prevented the Christian from testifying against the Mahometan, openly pronounces the incompetency of the whole African race, whether bond or free, to testify against a white man in any case, and thus, after surrendering the slave to all possible outrage, crowns its tyranny by excluding the very testimony through which the bloody cruelty of the Slave-Master might be exposed.

Thus in its Law does Slavery paint itself; but it is only when we look at details, and detect its essential elements, *five in number,* all inspired by *a single motive,* that its character becomes completely manifest.

Foremost, of course, in these elements, is the impossible pretension, where Barbarism is lost in impiety, by which man claims *property in man.* Against such blasphemy the argument is brief. According to the Law of Nature, written by the same hand that placed the planets in their orbits, and, like them, constituting part of the eternal system of the Universe, every human being

has complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but this birthright is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods; but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent, — no capture — no middle passage, — no change of clime, — no purchase-money, — no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible, God-given franchise. And a divine mandate, strong as that which guards Life, guards Liberty also. Even at the very morning of Creation, when God said, "Let there be Light," — earlier than the malediction against murder, — he set the everlasting difference between man and chattel, giving to man "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

> "That right we hold
> By his donation; but man over men
> He made not lord: such title to himself
> Reserving, human left from human free."[1]

Slavery tyrannically assumes power which Heaven denied, — while, under its barbarous necromancy, borrowed from the Source of Evil, a man is changed into a chattel, a person is withered into a thing, a soul is shrunk into merchandise. Say, Sir, in lofty madness, that you own the sun, the stars, the moon; but do not say that you own a man, endowed with soul to live immortal, when sun and moon and stars have passed away.

Secondly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of marriage*, recognized as a sacrament by the Church, and as a contract by the civil power, wher-

[1] Milton, Paradise Lost, Book XII., 68–71.

ever civilization prevails. Under the Law of Slavery no such sacrament is respected, and no such contract can exist. The ties formed between slaves are all subject to the selfish interests or more selfish lust of the master, whose license knows no check. Natural affections which have come together are rudely torn asunder: nor is this all. Stripped of every defence, the chastity of a whole race is exposed to violence, while the result is recorded in tell-tale faces of children, glowing with a master's blood, but doomed for their mother's skin to Slavery through descending generations. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], galled by the comparison between Slavery and Polygamy, winces. I hail this sensibility as the sign of virtue. Let him reflect, and he will confess that there are many disgusting elements in Slavery, not present in Polygamy, while the single disgusting element of Polygamy is more than present in Slavery. By license of Polygamy, one man may have many wives, all bound to him by marriage-tie, and in other respects protected by law. By license of Slavery, a whole race is delivered over to prostitution and concubinage, without the protection of any law. Surely, Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Thirdly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of the parental relation,* provided by God in his benevolence for the nurture and education of the human family, and constituting an essential part of Civilization itself. And yet by the Law of Slavery — happily beginning to be modified in some places — this relation is set at nought, and in its place is substituted the arbitrary control of the master, at whose mere command little children, such as the Saviour called unto

him, though clasped by a mother's arms, are swept under the hammer of the auctioneer. I do not dwell on this exhibition. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Fourthly, Slavery paints itself again *in closing the gates of knowledge*, which are also the shining gates of Civilization. Under its plain, unequivocal law, the bondman, at the unrestrained will of his master, is shut out from all instruction; while in many places — incredible to relate — the law itself, by cumulative provisions, positively forbids that he shall be taught to read! Of course the slave cannot be allowed to read: for his soul would then expand in larger air, while he saw the glory of the North Star, and also the helping truth, that God, who made iron, never made a slave; for he would then become familiar with the Scriptures, with the Decalogue still speaking in the thunders of Sinai, — with that ancient text, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death"[1] — with that other text, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal,"[2] — with that great story of Redemption, when the Lord raised the slave-born Moses to deliver his chosen people from the house of bondage, — and with that sublimer story, where the Saviour died a cruel death, that all men, without distinction of race, might be saved, leaving to mankind a commandment which, even without his example, makes Slavery impossible. Thus, in order to fasten your manacles upon the slave, you fasten other manacles upon his soul. The ancients maintained Slavery by chains and death: you maintain it by that infinite despotism and monopoly through which human nature itself is degraded. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

[1] Exodus, xxi. 16. [2] Colossians, iv. 1.

Fifthly. Slavery paints itself again *in the appropriation of all the toil* of its victims, excluding them from that property in their own earnings which the Law of Nature allows and Civilization secures. The painful injustice of this pretension is lost in its meanness. It is robbery and petty larceny under garb of law. And even the meanness is lost in the absurdity of its associate pretension, that the African, thus despoiled of all earnings, is saved from poverty, and that for his own good he must work for his master, and not for himself. Alas, by such fallacy is a whole race pauperized! And yet this transaction is not without illustrative example. A sombre poet, whose verse has found wide favor, pictures a creature who

> "with one hand put
> A penny in the urn of poverty,
> And with the other took a shilling out." [1]

And a celebrated traveller through Russia, more than a generation ago, describes a kindred spirit, who, while devoutly crossing himself at church with his right hand, with the left deliberately picked the pocket of a fellow-sinner by his side.[2] Not admiring these instances, I cannot cease to deplore a system which has much of both, while, under affectation of charity, it sordidly takes from the slave all the fruits of his bitter sweat, and thus takes from him the main spring to exertion. Tell me, Sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Such is Slavery in its five special elements of Barbarism, as recognized by law: first, assuming that man can hold property in man; secondly, abrogating the relation

[1] Pollok, Course of Time, Book VIII. 632–634.

[2] Clarke, E. D., Travels in Europe, Asia, and Africa, (London, 1816,) Vol. I. pp. 72, 73.

of husband and wife; thirdly, abrogating the parental tie; fourthly, closing the gates of knowledge; and, fifthly, appropriating the unpaid labor of another. Take away these elements, sometimes called "abuses," and Slavery will cease to exist; for it is these very "abuses" which constitute Slavery. Take away any one of them, and the abolition of Slavery begins. And when I present Slavery for judgment, I mean no slight evil, with regard to which there may be reasonable difference of opinion, but I mean this fivefold embodiment of "abuse," this ghastly quincunx of Barbarism, each particular of which, if considered separately, must be denounced at once with all the ardor of an honest soul, while the whole fivefold combination must awake a fivefold denunciation. The historic pirates, once the plague of the Gulf whose waters they plundered, have been praised for the equity with which they adjusted the ratable shares of spoil, and also for generous benefactions to the poor, and even to churches, so that Sir Walter Scott could say, —

> "Do thou revere
> The statutes of the Buccaneer."[1]

In our Law of Slavery what is there to revere? what is there at which the soul does not rise in abhorrence?

But this fivefold combination becomes yet more hateful when its *single motive* is considered; and here Slavery paints itself finally. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS] says that it is "but a form of civil government for those who by their nature are not fit to govern themselves." The Senator is mistaken. It is an outrage, where five different pretensions all concur in one single object, looking only to the profit

[1] Rokeby, Canto I. st. 21.

of the master, and constituting its ever-present motive power, which is simply *to compel the labor of fellow-men without wages.* If I pronounce this object not only barbarous, but brutal, I follow the judgment of Luther's Bible, in the book "Jesus Sirach," known in our translation as Ecclesiasticus, where it is said: "He that giveth not his wages to the laborer, *he is a bloodhound.*"[1]

Slavery is often exposed as degrading Humanity. On this fruitful theme nobody has expressed himself with the force and beautiful eloquence of our own Channing. His generous soul glowed with indignation at the thought of man, supremest creature of earth, and first of God's works, despoiled of manhood and changed to a thing. But earlier than Channing was Jean Jacques Rousseau, who, with similar eloquence and the same glowing indignation, vindicated Humanity. How grandly he insists that nobody can consent to be a slave, or can be born a slave! Believing Liberty the most noble of human attributes, this wonderful writer will not stop to consider if descent to the condition of beasts be not to degrade human nature, if renunciation of the most precious of all God's gifts be not to offend the Author of our being; but he demands only by what right those who degrade themselves to this depth can subject their posterity to this same ignominy, renouncing for them goods which do not depend upon any ancestors, and without which life itself is to all

1 "*Wer dem Arbeiter seinen Lohn nicht gibt, der ist ein Bluthund.*" (Cap. xxxv. 27.) Our less energetic version pictures the same enormity: "The bread of the needy is their life: he that defraudeth him thereof is a man of blood." (Ecclesiasticus, xxxiv. 21.) The prophet Jeremiah unites in this judgment: "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service *without wages*, and giveth him not for his work." Chap. xxii. 13.

worthy of it a burden; and he justly concludes, that, as, to establish Slavery, it is necessary to violate Nature, so, to perpetuate this claim, it is necessary to change Nature. His final judgment, being the practical conclusion of this outburst, holds up jurisconsults, gravely pronouncing that the child of a slave is born a slave, as deciding, in other terms, that a man is not born a man,[1] — thus exposing the peculiar absurdity of that pretension by which Slavery is transmitted from the mother to her offspring, as expressed in the Latin scrap on which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] relies: *Partus sequitur ventrem.*

If the offence of Slavery were less extended, if it were confined to some narrow region, if it had less of grandeur in its proportions, if its victims were counted by tens and hundreds instead of millions, the five-headed enormity would find little indulgence; all would rise against it, while Religion and Civilization would lavish choicest efforts in the general warfare. But what is wrong when done to one man cannot be right when done to many. If it is wrong thus to degrade a single soul, if it is wrong thus to degrade you, Mr. President, it cannot be right to degrade a whole race. And yet this is denied by the barbarous logic of Slavery, which, taking advantage of its own wrong, claims immunity because its usurpation has assumed a front of audacity that cannot be safely attacked. Unhappily, there is Barbarism elsewhere in the world; but American Slavery, as defined by existing law, stands forth as the greatest organized Barbarism on which the sun now looks. It is without a single peer. Its author, after making it, broke the die.

[1] Discours sur l'Origine de l'Inégalité parmi les Hommes, 2nde Partie: Œuvres, Tom. IV. p. 179.

If curiosity carries us to the origin of this law, — and here I approach a topic often considered in this Chamber, — we shall again confess its Barbarism. It is not derived from the Common Law, that fountain of Liberty; for this law, while unhappily recognizing a system of servitude known as villeinage, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave, — guarded his person against mayhem, — protected his wife against rape, — gave to his marriage equal validity with the marriage of his master, — and surrounded his offspring with generous presumptions of Freedom, unlike that rule of yours by which the servitude of the mother is necessarily stamped upon the child. It is not derived from the Roman Law, that fountain of Tyranny, for two reasons: first, because this law, in its better days, when its early rigors were spent, like the Common Law itself, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave, — in certain cases of cruelty rescued him from his master, prevented separation of parents and children, also of brothers and sisters, and even protected him in the marriage relation; and, secondly, because the Thirteen Colonies were not derived from any of those countries which recognized the Roman Law, while this law, even before the discovery of this continent, had lost all living efficacy. It is not derived from the Mohammedan Law; for, under the mild injunctions of the Koran, a benignant servitude, unlike yours, has prevailed, — where the lash is not allowed to lacerate the back of a female, — where no knife or branding-iron is employed upon any human being, to mark him as the property of his fellow-man, — where the master is expressly enjoined to favor the desires of his slave for emancipation, — and where the blood of

the master, mingling with that of his bondwoman, takes from her the transferable character of chattel, and confers complete freedom upon their offspring. It is not derived from the Spanish Law; for this law contains humane elements unknown to your system, borrowed, perhaps, from Mohammedan Moors who so long occupied Spain; and, besides, our Thirteen Colonies had no umbilical connection with Spain. Nor is it derived from English statutes or American statutes; for we have the positive and repeated averment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], and also of other Senators, that in not a single State of the Union can any such statutes establishing Slavery be found. From none of these does it come.

No, Sir, not from any land of Civilization is this Barbarism derived. It comes from Africa, ancient nurse of monsters, — from Guinea, Dahomey, and Congo. There is its origin and fountain. This benighted region, we are told by Chief-Justice Marshall in a memorable judgment,[1] still asserts a right, discarded by Christendom, to enslave captives taken in war; and this African Barbarism is the beginning of American Slavery. The Supreme Court of Georgia, a Slave State, has not shrunk from this conclusion. "Licensed to hold slave property," says the Court, "the Georgia planter held the slave as a chattel, either directly from the slave-trader or from those who held under him, and he from the slave-captor in Africa. The property of the planter in the slave became thus the property of the original captor."[2] It is natural that a right thus derived in defiance of Christendom, and openly founded on the

[1] The Antelope, 10 Wheaton, 66.

[2] Neal *v.* Farmer, 9 Georgia Reports, 580.

most vulgar Paganism, should be exercised without mitigating influence from Christianity, — that the master's authority over the person of his slave, over his conjugal relations, over his parental relations, over the employment of his time, over all his acquisitions, should be recognized, while no generous presumption inclines to Freedom, and the womb of the bondwoman can deliver only a slave.

From its home in Africa, where it is sustained by immemorial usage, this Barbarism, thus derived and thus developed, traversed the ocean to American soil. It entered on board that fatal slave-ship,

"Built in the eclipse, and rigged with curses dark,"

which in 1620 landed its cruel cargo at Jamestown, in Virginia; and it has boldly taken its place in every succeeding slave-ship, from that early day till now, — helping to pack the human freight, regardless of human agony, — surviving the torments of the middle passage, — surviving its countless victims plunged beneath the waves; and it has left the slave-ship only to travel inseparable from the slave in his various doom, sanctioning by its barbarous code every outrage, whether of mayhem or robbery, lash or lust, and fastening itself upon his offspring to the remotest generation. Thus are barbarous prerogatives of barbarous half-naked African chiefs perpetuated in American Slave-Masters, while the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], perhaps unconscious of their origin, perhaps desirous to secure for them the appearance of a less barbarous pedigree, tricks them out with a phrase of the Roman Law, discarded by the Common Law, which simply renders into ancient Latin an existing rule of African Barbarism, recognized as an existing rule of American Slavery.

Such is the plain juridical origin of the American slave code, now vaunted as a badge of Civilization. But all law, whatever its juridical origin, whether Christian or Mohammedan, Roman or African, may be traced to other and ampler influences in Nature, sometimes of Right and sometimes of Wrong. Surely the law which stamped the slave-trade as piracy punishable with death had a different inspiration from that other law which secured immunity for the slave-trade throughout an immense territory, and invested its supporters with political power. As there is a nobler law above, so there is a meaner law below, and each is felt in human affairs.

Thus far we have seen Slavery only in pretended law, and in the origin of that law. Here I might stop, without proceeding in the argument; for on the letter of the law alone must Slavery be condemned. But the tree is known by its fruits, which I shall now exhibit: and this brings me to the second stage of the argument.

(2.) In considering *the practical results of Slavery*, the materials are so obvious and diversified that my chief care will be to abridge and reject: and here I put the Slave States and Free States face to face, showing at each point the blasting influence of Slavery.

Before proceeding with these details, I would for one moment expose that degradation of free labor, which is one of the general results. Where there are slaves, whose office is work, it is held disreputable for a white man to soil his skin or harden his hands with honest toil. The Slave-Master of course declines work, and his pernicious example infects all others. With impi-

ous resolve, they would reverse the Almighty decree appointing labor as the duty of man, and declaring that in the sweat of his face shall he eat his bread. The Slave-Master says, "No! this is true of the slave, of the black man, but not of the white man: he shall not eat his bread in the sweat of his face." Thus is the brand of degradation stamped upon that daily toil which contributes so much to a true Civilization. It is a constant boast in the Slave States, that white men there will not perform work performed in the Free States. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Waddy Thompson made this boast. Let it be borne in mind, then, that, where Slavery prevails, there is not only despair for the black man, but inequality and ignominy for the white laborer. By necessary consequence, the latter, whether emigrating from our Free States or fleeing from oppression and wretchedness in his European home, avoids a region disabled by such a social law. Hence a twofold injustice: practically he is excluded from the land, while the land itself becomes a prey to that paralysis which is caused by a violation of the laws of God. And now for the testimony.

The States where this Barbarism exists excel the Free States in all natural advantages. Their territory is more extensive, stretching over 851,448 square miles, while the Free States, including California, embrace only 612,597 square miles. Here is a difference of more than 238,000 square miles in favor of the Slave States, showing that Freedom starts in this great rivalry with a field more than a quarter less than that of Slavery. In happiness of climate, adapted to productions of special value, — in exhaustless motive power distributed throughout its space, — in natural

highways, by more than fifty navigable rivers, never closed by the rigors of winter, — and in a stretch of coast, along Ocean and Gulf, indented by hospitable harbors, — the whole presenting incomparable advantages for that true Civilization, where agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, both domestic and foreign, blend, — in all these respects the Slave States excel the Free States, whose climate is often churlish, whose motive power is less various, whose navigable rivers are fewer and often sealed by ice, and whose coast, while less in extent and with fewer harbors, is often perilous from storm and cold.

But Slavery plays the part of a Harpy, and defiles the choicest banquet. See what it does with this territory, thus spacious and fair.

An important indication of prosperity is in the growth of *population*. In this respect the two regions started equal. In 1790, at the first census under the Constitution, the population of the present Slave States was 1,961,372, of the present Free States 1,968,455, showing a difference of only 7,083 in favor of the Free States. This difference, at first merely nominal, has been constantly increasing since, showing itself more strongly in each decennial census, until, in 1850, the population of the Slave States, swollen by the annexation of three foreign Territories, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, was only 9,612,969, while that of the Free States, without such large annexations, reached 13,434,922, showing a difference of 3,821,953 in favor of Freedom. But this difference becomes still more remarkable, if we confine our inquiries to the white population, which at this period was only 6,184,477 in the Slave States, while it was 13,238,670 in the Free States, showing a difference

of 7,054,193, in favor of Freedom, and showing also that the white population of the Free States had not only doubled, but, while occupying a smaller territory, commenced to triple, that of the Slave States. The comparative sparseness of the two populations furnishes another illustration. In the Slave States the average number of inhabitants to a square mile was 11.29, while in the Free States it was 21.93, or almost two to one in favor of Freedom.

These results are general; but if we take any particular Slave State, and compare it with a Free State, we shall find the same marked evidence for Freedom. Take Virginia, with a territory of 61,352 miles, and New York, with a territory of 47,000, or over 14,000 square miles less than her sister State. New York has one seaport, Virginia some three or four; New York has one noble river, Virginia has several; New York for 400 miles runs along the frozen line of Canada, Virginia basks in a climate of constant felicity. But Freedom is better than climate, river, or seaport. In 1790 the population of Virginia was 748,308, and in 1850 it was 1,421,661. In 1790 the population of New York was 340,120, and in 1850 it was 3,097,394. That of Virginia had not doubled in sixty years, while that of New York had multiplied more than nine-fold. A similar comparison may be made between Kentucky, with 37,680 square miles, admitted into the Union as long ago as 1792, and Ohio, with 39,964 square miles, admitted into the Union in 1802. In 1850, the Slave State had a population of only 982,405, while Ohio had a population of 1,980,329, showing a difference of nearly a million in favor of Freedom.

As in population, so also in *the value of property, real*

and personal, do the Free States excel the Slave States. According to the census of 1850, the value of property in the Free States was $4,102,162,098, while in the Slave States it was $2,036,090,737; or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, only $1,655,945,137, — showing an enormous difference of billions in favor of Freedom. In the Free States the valuation per acre was $10.46, in the Slave States only $3.04. This disproportion was still greater in 1855, when, according to the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, the valuation of the Free States was $5,770,197,679, or $14.71 per acre; and of the Slave States, $3,977,354,046, or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, $2,505,186,446, or $4.59 per acre. Thus in five years from 1850 the valuation of property in the Free States received an increase of more than the whole accumulated valuation of the Slave States in 1850.

Looking at details, we find the same disproportions. Arkansas and Michigan, nearly equal in territory, were organized as States by simultaneous Acts of Congress; and yet in 1855 the whole valuation of Arkansas, including its asserted property in human flesh, was only $64,240,726, while that of Michigan, without a single slave, was $116,593,580. The whole accumulated valuation of all the Slave States, deducting the asserted property in human flesh, in 1850, was only $1,655,945,137; but the valuation of New York alone, in 1855, reached the nearly equal sum of $1,401,285,279. The valuation of Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Texas, all together, in 1850, deducting human flesh, was $559,224,920, or simply $1.96 per acre, — being less than that of Massachusetts alone, which was $573,342,286, or $114.85 per acre.

The Slave States boast of *agriculture;* but here again, notwithstanding superior natural advantages, they must yield to the Free States at every point, — in the number of farms and plantations, in the number of acres improved, in the cash value of farms, in the average value per acre, and in the value of farming implements and machinery. Here is a short table.

	Free States.	Slave States.
Number of farms, . . .	873,608	569,201
Acres of improved land, . .	57,720,494	54,970,327
Cash value of farms, . .	$ 2,147,218,478	$ 1,117,649,649
Average value per acre, . .	$ 19.17	$ 6.18
Value of farming implements,	$ 85,840,141	$ 65,345,625

Such is the mighty contrast. But it does not stop here. Careful tables place the agricultural products of the Free States, for the year ending June, 1850, at $ 888,634,334, while those of the Slave States were $ 631,277,417; the product per acre in the Free States at $ 7.94, and the product per acre in the Slave States at $ 3.49; the average product of each agriculturist in the Free States at $ 342, and in the Slave States at $ 171. Thus the Free States, with a smaller population engaged in agriculture than the Slave States, and with smaller territory, show an annual sum total of agricultural products surpassing those of the Slave States by two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars, while twice as much is produced by each agriculturist, and more than twice as much is produced on an acre. The monopoly of cotton, rice, and cane-sugar, with a climate granting two and sometimes three crops in the year, is thus impotent in competition with Freedom.

In *manufactures, mining, and the mechanic arts* the failure of the Slave States is greater still. It appears

at all points, — in the capital employed, in the value of the raw material, in the annual wages, and in the annual product. A short table will show the contrast.

	Free States.	Slave States.
Capital, ...	$ 430,240,051	$ 95,029,877
Value of raw material, . .	465,844,092	86,190,639
Annual wages, ...	195,436,453	33,247,560
Annual product, . . .	842,586,058	165,423,027

This might be illustrated by details with regard to different manufactures, — as shoes, cotton, woollens, pig iron, wrought iron, and iron castings, — all showing the contrast. It might also be illustrated by comparison between different States, — showing, for instance, that the manufactures of Massachusetts, during the last year, exceeded those of all the Slave States combined.

In *commerce* the failure of the Slave States is on a yet larger scale. Under this head the census does not supply proper statistics, and we are left to approximations from other sources; but these are enough for our purpose. It appears, that, of products which enter into commerce, the Free States had an amount valued at $ 1,377,199,968, the Slave States an amount valued only at $ 410,754,992; that, of persons engaged in trade, the Free States had 136,856, and the Slave States 52,622; and that, of tonnage employed, the Free States had 2,791,096 tons, and the Slave States only 726,284. This was in 1850. But in 1855 the disproportion was still greater, the Free States having 4,320,768 tons, and the Slave States 855,510 tons, being a difference of five to one, — and the tonnage of Massachusetts alone being 979,210 tons, an amount larger than that of all the Slave States together. The tonnage built during this year by the Free States was 528,844 tons, by the

Slave States 52,938 tons. Maine alone built 215,905 tons, or more than four times the whole built in the Slave States.

The foreign commerce of the Free States, in 1855, as indicated by exports and imports, was $404,365,503; of the Slave States, $132,062,196. The exports of the Free States were $167,520,693; of the Slave States, including the vaunted cotton crop, $107,475,668. The imports of the Free States were $236,844,810; of the Slave States, $24,586,528. The foreign commerce of New York alone was more than twice as large as that of all the Slave States; her imports were larger, and her exports were larger also. Add to this evidence of figures the testimony of a Virginian, Mr. Loudon, in a letter written just before the sitting of a Southern Commercial Convention. Thus he complains and testifies: —

"There are not half a dozen vessels engaged in our own trade that are owned in Virginia; and I have been unable to find a vessel at Liverpool loading for Virginia within three years, during the height of our busy season."

Railroads and canals are the avenues of commerce; and here again the Free States excel. Of railroads in operation in 1854, there were 13,105 miles in the Free States, and 4,212 in the Slave States. Of canals there were 3,682 miles in the Free States, and 1,116 in the Slave States.

The *Post-Office*, which is the agent not only of commerce, but of civilization, joins in the uniform testimony. According to the tables for 1859, the postage collected in the Free States was $5,581,749, and the expense of carrying the mails $6,945,545, leaving a deficit of

$1,363,796. In the Slave States the amount collected was only $1,936,167, and the expense of carrying the mails $5,947,076, leaving the enormous deficit of $4,010,909, — the difference between the two deficits being $2,647,113. The Slave States did not pay one third of the expense in transporting their own mails; and not a single Slave State paid for transporting its own mails, not even the small State of Delaware. Massachusetts, besides paying for hers, had a surplus larger by one half than the whole amount collected in South Carolina.

According to the census of 1850, the value of *churches* in the Free States was $66,177,586; in the Slave States, $20,683,265.

The *voluntary charity* contributed in 1855, for certain leading purposes of Christian benevolence, was, in the Free States, $955,511; for the same purposes in the Slave States, $193,885. For the Bible cause the Free States contributed $321,365; the Slave States, $67,226. For the Missionary cause the former contributed $502,174; and the latter, $101,934. For the Tract Society the former contributed $131,972; and the latter, $24,725. The amount contributed for Missions by Massachusetts was greater than that contributed by all the Slave States, and more than eight times that contributed by South Carolina.

Nor have the Free States been backward in charity for the benefit of the Slave States. The records of Massachusetts show that as long ago as 1781, at the beginning of the Government, there was a contribution throughout the Commonwealth, under the particular direction of that eminent patriot, Samuel Adams, for the relief of inhabitants of South Carolina and Georgia.[1]

[1] Wells, Life of Samuel Adams, Vol. III. pp. 138, 139.

In 1855 we were saddened by the prevalence of yellow fever in Portsmouth, Virginia; and now, from a report of the Relief Committee of that place, we learn that the amount of charity contributed by the Slave States, exclusive of Virginia, the afflicted State, was $12,182; and including Virginia, it was $33,398; while $42,547 was contributed by the Free States.

In all this array we see the fatal influence of Slavery. But its Barbarism is yet more conspicuous, when we consider its *Educational Establishments,* and the unhappy results naturally ensuing from their imperfect character.

Of *colleges,* in 1856, the Free States had 61, and the Slave States 59; but the comparative efficacy of the institutions assuming this name may be measured by certain facts. The number of graduates in the Free States was 47,752, in the Slave States 19,648; the number of ministers educated in Slave colleges was 747, in Free colleges 10,702; and the number of volumes in the libraries of Slave colleges 308,011, in the libraries of Free colleges 668,497. If materials were at hand for comparison between these colleges, in buildings, cabinets, and scientific apparatus, or in standard of scholarship, the difference would be still more apparent.

Of *professional schools,* teaching law, medicine, and theology, the Free States had 65, with 269 professors, 4,417 students, and 175,951 volumes in their libraries; while the Slave States had only 32 professional schools, with 122 professors, 1,816 students, and 30,796 volumes in their libraries. The whole number educated at these institutions in the Free States was 23,513, in the Slave States 3,812. Of these, the largest number in the Slave

States study medicine, next theology, and lastly law. According to the census, there are only 808 students in the Slave theological schools, and 747 studying for the ministry in Slave colleges; and this is the education of the Slave clergy. In the law schools of the Slave States the number of students is only 240, this being the sum-total of public students in the land of Slavery devoted to that profession which is the favorite stepping-stone to political life, where Slave-Masters claim such a disproportion of office and honor.

Of *academies and private schools*, in 1850, the Free States, notwithstanding multitudinous public schools, had 3,197, with 7,175 teachers, 154,893 pupils, and an annual income of $2,457,372; the Slave States had 2,797 academies and private schools, with 4,913 teachers, 104,976 pupils, and an annual income of $2,079,724. In the absence of public schools, to a large extent, where Slavery exists, the dependence must be upon private schools; and yet even here the Slave States fall below the Free States, whether we consider the number of schools, the number of pupils, the number of teachers, or the amount paid for their support.

In *public schools*, open to all, poor and rich alike, the preëminence of the Free States is complete. Here the figures show a difference as wide as that between Freedom and Slavery. Their number in the Free States is 62,433, with 72,621 teachers, and with 2,769,901 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $6,780,337. Their number in the Slave States is 18,507, with 19,307 teachers, and with 581,861 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $2,719,534. This difference may be illustrated by details. Virginia, an old State, and more than a third larger than Ohio, has 67,353 pupils

in her public schools, while the latter State has 484,153. Arkansas, equal in age and size with Michigan, has only 8,493 pupils at her public schools, while the latter State has 110,455. South Carolina, nearly four times as large as Massachusetts, has 17,838 pupils at public schools, while the latter State has 176,475. South Carolina spends for this purpose, annually, $200,600; Massachusetts, $1,006,795. Baltimore, with a population of 169,054, on the northern verge of Slavery, has school buildings valued at $105,729; Boston, with a population of 136,881, has school buildings valued at $729,502. Baltimore has only 37 public schools, with 138 teachers, and 8,011 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $32,423; Boston has 203 public schools, with 353 teachers, and 20,369 pupils, supported at an annual expense of $237,100. Even these figures do not disclose the whole difference; for there exist in the Free States teachers' institutes, normal schools, lyceums, and public courses of lectures, unknown in the region of Slavery. These advantages are enjoyed by the children of colored persons; and here is a comparison which shows the degradation of the Slave States. It is their habit particularly to deride free colored persons. See, now, with what cause. The number of colored persons in the Free States is 196,016, of whom 22,043, or more than one ninth, attend school, which is a larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of the Slave States. In Massachusetts there are 9,064 colored persons, of whom 1,439, or nearly one sixth, attend school, which is a much larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of South Carolina.

Among educational establishments are *public libraries;* and here, again, the Free States have their cus-

tomary eminence, whether we consider libraries strictly called public, or libraries of the common school, Sunday school, college, and church. The disclosures are startling. The number of libraries in the Free States is 14,893, and the sum-total of volumes is 3,883,617; the number of libraries in the Slave States is 713, and the sum-total of volumes is 654,194: showing an excess for Freedom of more than fourteen thousand libraries, and more than three millions of volumes. In the Free States the common-school libraries are 11,881, and contain 1,589,683 volumes; in the Slave States they are 186, and contain 57,721 volumes. In the Free States the Sunday-school libraries are 1,713, and contain 474,241 volumes; in the Slave States they are 275, and contain 68,080 volumes. In the Free States the college libraries are 132, and contain 660,573 volumes; in the Slave States they are 79, and contain 249,248 volumes. In the Free States the church libraries are 109, and contain 52,723 volumes; in the Slave States they are 21, and contain 5,627 volumes. In the Free States the libraries strictly called public, and not included under heads already enumerated, are 1,058, and contain 1,106,397 volumes; those of the Slave States are 152, and contain 273,518 volumes.

Turn these figures over, look at them in any light, and the conclusion is irresistible for Freedom. The college libraries alone of the Free States are greater than all the libraries of Slavery; so, also, are the libraries of Massachusetts alone greater than all the libraries of Slavery; and the common-school libraries alone of New York are more than twice as large as all the libraries of Slavery. Michigan has 107,943 volumes in her libraries; Arkansas has 420; and yet the Acts for

the admission of these two States into the Union were passed on the same day.

Among educational establishments, one of the most efficient is the *press;* and here again all things testify for Freedom. The Free States excel in the number of newspapers and periodicals published, whether daily, semi-weekly, weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, or quarterly, — and whatever their character, whether literary, neutral, political, religious, or scientific. The whole aggregate circulation in the Free States is 334,146,281, in the Slave States 81,038,693; in Free Michigan 3,247,736, in Slave Arkansas 377,000; in Free Ohio 30,473,407, in Slave Kentucky 6,582,838; in Slave South Carolina 7,145,930, in Free Massachusetts 64,-820,564, — a larger number than in the twelve Slave States, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, combined. This enormous disproportion in the aggregate is also preserved in the details. In the Slave States political newspapers find more favor than all others together; but even of these they publish only 47,243,209 copies, while the Free States publish 163,583,668. Numerous as are political newspapers in the Free States, they form considerably less than one half the aggregate circulation of the Press, while in the Slave States they constitute nearly three fifths. Of neutral newspapers the Slave States publish 8,812,620, the Free States 79,156,733. Of religious newspapers the Slave States publish 4,364,-832, the Free States 29,280,652. Of literary journals the Slave States publish 20,245,360, the Free States 57,478,768. And of scientific journals the Slave States publish 372,672, the Free States 4,521,260. Of these

last the number of copies published in Massachusetts alone is 2,033,260, — more than five times the number in the whole land of Slavery. Thus, in contributions to science, literature, religion, and even politics, as attested by the activity of the periodical press, do the Slave States miserably fail, — while darkness gathers over them, increasing with time. According to the census of 1810, the disproportion in this respect between the two regions was only as two to one; it is now more than four to one, and is still darkening.

The same disproportion appears with regard to persons connected with the Press. In the Free States the number of *printers* was 11,812, of whom 1,229 were in Massachusetts; in the Slave States there were 2,625, of whom South Carolina had only 141. In the Free States the number of *publishers* was 331; in the Slave States, 24. Of these, Massachusetts had 51, or more than twice as many as all the Slave States; while South Carolina had but one. In the Free States the *authors* were 73; in the Slave States, 6, — Massachusetts having 17, and South Carolina none. These suggestive illustrations are all derived from the last official census. If we go to other sources, the contrast is still the same. Of the authors mentioned in Duyckinck's "Cyclopædia of American Literature," 434 are of the Free States, and only 90 of the Slave States. Of the poets mentioned in Griswold's "Poets and Poetry of America," 122 are of the Free States, and only 16 of the Slave States. Of the poets whose place of birth appears in Read's "Female Poets of America," 71 are of the Free States, and only 11 of the Slave States. If we try authors by weight or quality, it is the same as when we try them by numbers. Out of the Free States come all whose

works have a place in the permanent literature of the country, — Irving, Prescott, Sparks, Bancroft, Emerson, Motley, Hildreth, Hawthorne; also, Bryant, Longfellow, Dana, Halleck, Whittier, Lowell, — and I might add indefinitely to the list. But what name from the Slave States can find entrance there?

A similar disproportion appears in the number of *Patents*, during the last three years, 1857, 1858, and 1859, attesting the inventive industry of the contrasted regions. In the Free States there were 9,557; in the Slave States, 1,306: making a difference of 8,251 in favor of Freedom. The number in Free Massachusetts was 1,351; in Slave South Carolina, 39. The number in Free Connecticut, small in territory and population, was 628; in Slave Virginia, large in territory and population, 184.

From these things we might infer the *ignorance* prevalent in the Slave States; but this shows itself in specific results of a deplorable character, authenticated by the official census. In the Slave States there were 493,026 native white adults, persons over twenty years of age, unable to read and write; while in the Free States, with double the native white population, there were but 248,725 persons of this class in this unhappy predicament: in the Slave States the proportion being 1 in 5 of the adult native whites; in the Free States 1 in 22. The number in Free Massachusetts, in an adult native white population of 470,375, was 1,055, or 1 in 446; the number in Slave South Carolina, in a like population of only 120,136, was 15,580, or 1 in 8. The number in Free Connecticut was 1 in 256, in Slave Virginia 1 in 5; in Free New Hampshire 1 in 192, and in Slave North Carolina 1 in 3.

Before leaving this picture, where the dismal colors all come from official sources, there are two other aspects in which Slavery may be regarded.

1. The first is its influence on *emigration.* The official compendium of the census (page 115) tells us that inhabitants of Slave States who are natives of Free States are more numerous than inhabitants of Free States who are natives of Slave States. This is an egregious error. Just the contrary is true. The census of 1850 found 606,139 in the Free States who were born in the Slave States, while only 206,624 born in the Free States were in the Slave States. And since the white population of the Free States is double that of the Slave States, it appears that the proportion of whites moving from Slavery is six times greater than that of whites moving into Slavery. This simple fact discloses something of the aversion to Slavery which is aroused even in the Slave States.

2. The second is furnished by the character of the region on the border-line between Freedom and Slavery. In general, the value of lands in Slave States adjoining Freedom is advanced, while the value of corresponding lands in Free States is diminished. The effects of Freedom and Slavery are reciprocal. Slavery is a bad neighbor; Freedom is a good neighbor. In Virginia, lands naturally poor are, by nearness to Freedom, worth $ 12.98 an acre, while richer lands in other parts of the State are worth only $ 8.42. In Illinois, lands bordering on Slavery are worth only $ 4.54 an acre, while other lands in Illinois are worth $ 8.05. As in the value of lands, so in all other influences is Slavery felt for evil, and Freedom felt for good; and thus is it clearly shown to be for the interest of the Slave States to be surrounded by a circle of Free States.

At every point is the character of Slavery more and more manifest, rising and dilating into an overshadowing Barbarism, darkening the whole land. Through its influence, population, values of all kinds, manufactures, commerce, railroads, canals, charities, the post-office, colleges, professional schools, academies, public schools, newspapers, periodicals, books, authorship, inventions, are all stunted, and, under a Government which professes to be founded on the intelligence of the people, one in five of native white adults in the region of Slavery is officially reported as unable to read and write. Never was the saying of Montesquieu more triumphantly verified, that countries are not cultivated by reason of their fertility, but by reason of their liberty. To this truth the Slave States testify perpetually by every possible voice. Liberty is the powerful agent which drives the plough, the spindle, and the keel, — opens avenues of all kinds, — inspires charity, — awakens love of knowledge, and supplies the means of gratifying it. Liberty is the first of schoolmasters: nay, more; it is the Baconian philosophy of Civilization, through which the powers and activities of man are enlarged beyond measure or imagination.

Unerring and passionless figures thus far are our witnesses. But their testimony will be enhanced by a final glance at the *geographical character* of the Slave States; and here there is a singular and instructive parallel.

Jefferson described Virginia as "fast sinking" to be "the Barbary of the Union,"[1] — meaning, of course, the Barbary of his day, which had not yet turned against Slavery. And Franklin also wrote, that he did "not wish to see a new Barbary rising in America, and our

[1] Letter to Joseph C. Cabell, Nov. 28, 1820: Writings, Vol. VII. p. 187.

long extended coast occupied by piratical States."[1] In this each spoke with prophetic voice. Though on different sides of the Atlantic and on different continents, our Slave States and the original Barbary States occupy nearly the same parallels of latitude, occupy nearly the same extent of longitude, embrace nearly the same number of square miles, enjoy kindred advantages of climate, being equally removed from the cold of the North and the burning heat of the tropics, and also have similar boundaries of land and water, affording kindred advantages of ocean and sea, with this difference, that the boundaries of the two regions are precisely reversed, so that where is land in one is water in the other, while in both there is the same extent of ocean and the same extent of sea. Nor is this all. Algiers, for a long time the most obnoxious place in the Barbary States of Africa, once branded by an indignant chronicler as "the wall of the Barbarian world,"[2] is situated near the parallel of 36° 30′ north latitude, being the line of the Missouri Compromise, which once marked the wall of Slavery in our country west of the Mississippi, while Morocco, the chief present seat of Slavery in the African Barbary, is near the parallel of Charleston. There are no two spaces on the surface of the globe, equal in extent, (and careful examination will verify what I am about to state,) which present so many distinctive features of resemblance, whether we consider the common regions of latitude in which they lie, the common nature of their boundaries, their common productions, their common climate,

[1] Letter to David Hartley, May 8, 1783: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. IX. p. 521.

[2] Purchas's Pilgrims, Vol. II. p. 1565.

or the common Barbarism which sought shelter in both. I do not stop to inquire why Slavery — banished at last from Europe, banished also from that part of this hemisphere which corresponds in latitude to Europe — should have intrenched itself, in both hemispheres, in similar regions of latitude, so that Virginia, Carolina, Mississippi, and Missouri are the American complement to Morocco, Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis. But there is one important point in the parallel which remains to be fulfilled. The barbarous Emperor of Morocco, in the words of a treaty, so long ago as the last century, declared his desire that "the odious name of Slavery might be effaced from the memory of men";[1] while Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, whose tenacity for the Barbarism was equalled only by that of South Carolina, have renounced it one after another, and delivered it over to the indignation of mankind. Following this example, the parallel will be complete, and our Barbary will become the complement in Freedom to the African Barbary, as it has already been its complement in Slavery, and is unquestionably its complement in geographical character.

II.

From the consideration of Slavery in its practical results, illustrated by contrast between the Free States and Slave States, I pass to another stage of the argument, where Slavery appears in its influence on the

1 "Deseando ademas S. M. Marroqui que se borre de la memoria de los hombres el odioso nombre de esclavitud," etc. — *Treaty between Spain and Morocco*, March 1, 1799, Art. XIII.: Martens, Recueil des Traités, 2de Édit., Tom. VI. p. 590.

CHARACTER OF SLAVE-MASTERS. Nothing could I undertake more painful, and yet there is nothing more essential to the discussion, especially in response to pretensions of Senators on this floor, nor is there any point on which the evidence is more ample.

It is in the Character of Slavery itself that we are to find the Character of Slave-Masters. I need not go back to the golden mouth of Chrysostom to learn that "Slavery is the fruit of covetousness, of extravagance, of insatiable greediness";[1] for we have already seen that this fivefold enormity is inspired by the single idea of *compelling men to work without wages.* This spirit must naturally appear in the Slave-Master. But the eloquent Saint did not disclose the whole truth. Slavery is founded on violence, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kindred violence, sometimes against the defenceless slave, sometimes against the freeman whose indignation is aroused at the outrage. It is founded on brutal and vulgar pretensions, as is unhappily too apparent; of course it can be sustained only by kindred brutality and vulgarity. The denial of all rights in the slave can be sustained only by disregard of other rights, common to the whole community, whether of the person, the press, or speech. Where this exists there can be but one supreme law, to which all other laws, statute or social, are subordinate, — and this is the pretended law of Slavery. All these things must be manifest in Slave-Masters; and yet, unconscious of their true condition, they make boasts which reveal still further the unhappy influence. Barbarous standards of conduct are unblushingly avowed. The swagger of a bully is called

[1] In Epist. ad Ephes. Homil. XXII. 2.

chivalry; a swiftness to quarrel is called courage; the bludgeon is adopted as substitute for argument; and assassination is lifted to be one of the Fine Arts. Long ago it was fixed certain that the day which makes man a slave "takes half his worth away," — words from the ancient harp of Homer, sounding through long generations. Nothing here is said of the human being at the other end of the chain. To aver that on this same day all his worth is taken away might seem inconsistent with exceptions which we gladly recognize; but, alas! it is too clear, both from reason and from facts, that, bad as Slavery is for the Slave, it is worse for the Master.

In making this exposure I am fortified at the outset by two classes of authority, whose testimony it will be difficult to question: the first personal, and founded on actual experience; the second philosophical, and founded on everlasting truth.

First, *Personal Authority.* And here I adduce words, often quoted, which dropped from the lips of Slave-Masters in those better days, when, seeing the wrong of Slavery, they escaped from its injurious influence. Of these, none expressed themselves with more vigor than George Mason, a Slave-Master from Virginia, in debate on the adoption of the National Constitution. This is his language: —

"Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor, when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. *They produce the most pernicious effect on manners.* EVERY MASTER OF SLAVES IS BORN A PETTY TYRANT. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country."[1]

[1] Debates in the Federal Convention, August 22, 1787: Madison Papers, Vol. III. p. 1391.

Thus, with a few touches, does this Slave-Master portray his class, putting them in that hateful list which, according to every principle of liberty, must be resisted so long as we obey God. And this clear testimony received kindred support from the fiery soul of Jefferson. Here are his words: —

"There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the existence of Slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, THE MOST UNREMITTING DESPOTISM on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it. . . . . *The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.* And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, *transforms those into despots* and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part and the *amor patriæ* of the other! . . . . With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed."[1]

Next comes the *Philosophic Authority.* Here, while the language which I quote may be less familiar, it is hardly less commanding. Among names of such weight I shall not discriminate, but simply follow the order of time. First is John Locke, the great author of the English system of Intellectual Philosophy, who, though once unhappily indulgent to American Slavery, in another place describes it, in words which every Slave-Master should know, as —

"The state of war continued between a lawful conqueror and a captive." "So directly opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that *'t is hardly to be con-*

[1] Notes on Virginia, Query XVIII.

ceived that an Englishman, MUCH LESS A GENTLEMAN, *should plead for 't."* [1]

Then comes Adam Smith, the founder of the science of Political Economy, who, in his work on Morals, thus utters himself: —

"There is not a negro from the coast of Africa who does not possess a degree of magnanimity which the soul of his sordid master is too often scarce capable of conceiving. Fortune never exerted more cruelly her empire over mankind than when she subjected those nations of heroes to the refuse of the jails of Europe, to wretches who possess the virtues neither of the countries which they come from nor of those which they go to, *and whose levity, brutality, and baseness so justly expose them to the contempt of the vanquished."* [2]

This judgment, pronounced just a century ago, was repelled by the Slave-Masters of Virginia in a feeble publication, which attests at least their own consciousness that they were the criminals arraigned by the distinguished philosopher. This was soon followed by the testimony of the great English moralist, Dr. Johnson, who, in a letter to a friend, thus shows his opinion of Slave-Masters: —

"To omit for a year, or for a day, the most efficacious method of advancing Christianity, in compliance with any purposes that terminate on this side of the grave, is a crime of which I know not that the world has yet had an example, except in the practice of *the planters of America, a race of mortals whom, I suppose, no other man wishes to resemble."* [3]

[1] Of Government, Book II. ch. 4, Book I. ch. 1.

[2] Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part V. ch. 2.

[3] Letter to William Drummond, August 13, 1766: Boswell's Life of Johnson, ed. Croker, (London, 1835,) Vol. III. p. 11.

These are British voices. There are French also of equal character, whose is the same implacable judgment. First I name Condorcet, who did so much to develop the idea of Human Progress. Constantly he testifies against Slavery. His brand of it as Barbarism is sententiously expressed in a letter to Voltaire, describing a successful Slave-Master: —

"L'Éprémesnil is a little American, who, by dint of plying his negroes with the lash, has succeeded in getting enough sugar and indigo to buy an office of King's Councillor in the revenue service." [1]

Voltaire adds to this expression other words kindred in scorn: —

"The American savage of whom you speak does not astonish me; but he frightens me, for I know beyond doubt that he is of the horde of other French savages who have sworn immortal hate to reason." [2]

In harmony with these is that famous irony of Montesquieu, where, speaking of the Africans, he says: —

"It is impossible that we should suppose these people men; because, if we supposed them men, the world would begin to think that we ourselves were not Christians." [3]

Other countries might testify; but this is enough.

With such authorities, Personal and Philosophic, American and Foreign, I need not hesitate in this ungracious task; but Truth, which is mightier than Mason and Jefferson, than John Locke, Adam Smith, and Samuel Johnson, than Condorcet, Voltaire, and

[1] Condorcet, Œuvres, ed. O'Connor, Tom. I. p. 88, Décembre, 1775.
[2] Ibid., p. 98, 6 Février, 1776.
[3] Esprit des Lois, Liv. XV. ch. 5.

Montesquieu, marshals the evidence in unbroken succession.

Proceeding with the argument, broadening as we advance, we shall see Slave-Masters (1) in the Law of Slavery, (2) in relations with Slaves, (3) in relations with each other and with Society, and (4) in that unconsciousness which renders them insensible to their true character.

(1.) As in considering the Character of Slavery, so in considering the Character of Slave-Masters, we must begin with the *Law of Slavery*, which, as their work, testifies against them. In the face of this unutterable abomination, where impiety, cruelty, brutality, and robbery all strive for mastery, it is vain to assert humanity or refinement in its authors. Full well I know that the conscience, which speaks so powerfully to the solitary soul, is often silent in the corporate body, and that, in all ages and countries, numbers, when gathered in communities and States, have sanctioned acts from which the individual revolts. And yet I know no surer way of judging a people than by its laws, especially where those laws have been long continued and openly maintained.

Whatever may be the eminence of individual virtue, — and I would not so far disparage humanity as to suppose that offences so general where Slavery exists are universal, — it is not reasonable or logical to infer that the body of Slave-Masters are better than the Law of Slavery. And since the Law itself degrades the slave to be a chattel, and submits him to irresponsible control, — with power to bind and to scourge, to usurp the fruits of another's labor, to pollute the body, and to

outrage all ties of family, making marriage impossible, — we must conclude that such enormities are sanctioned by Slave-Masters; while the refusal of testimony, and the denial of instruction, by supplementary law, complete the evidence of complicity. And this conclusion must stand unquestioned, just so long as the Law of Slavery exists unrepealed. So mild and philosophical a judge as Tocqueville says, in his authoritative work: "The legislation of the Southern States with regard to slaves at the present day exhibits such unparalleled atrocities as suffice to show that the laws of humanity have been totally perverted, and to betray the desperate position of the community in which that legislation has been promulgated."[1] All of which is too true. Cease, then, to blazon the humanity of Slave-Masters. Tell me not of the lenity with which this cruel Code is tempered to its unhappy subjects. Tell me not of the sympathy which overflows from the mansion of the master to the cabin of the slave. In vain you assert such "happy accidents." In vain you show individuals who do not exert the wickedness of the law. The Barbarism still endures, solemnly, legislatively, judicially attested in the very SLAVE CODE, and proclaiming constantly the character of its authors. And this is the first article in the evidence against Slave-Masters.

(2.) I am next brought to *Slave-Masters in their relations with Slaves;* and here the argument is founded on facts, and on presumptions irresistible as facts. Only lately has inquiry burst into that gloomy world of bond-

[1] Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Chap. XVIII.: *Situation of the Black Population.*

age, and disclosed its secrets. But enough is already known to arouse the indignant condemnation of mankind. For instance, here is a simple advertisement — one of thousands — from the *Georgia Messenger*: —

"RUN AWAY. — My man Fountain; has holes in his ears, a scar on the right side of his forehead; has been shot in the hind parts of his legs; is marked on his back with the whip. Apply to Robert Beasley, Macon, Ga."

Holes in the ears; scar on the forehead; shot in the legs; and marks of the lash on the back! Such are tokens by which the Slave-Master identifies his slave.

Here is another advertisement, revealing Slave-Masters in a different light. It is from the *National Intelligencer*, published at the capital; and I confess the pain with which I cite such an indecency in a journal of much respectability. Of course it appeared without the knowledge of the editors; but it is none the less an illustrative example.

"FOR SALE. — An accomplished and handsome lady's-maid. She is just sixteen years of age; was raised in a genteel family in Maryland; and is now proposed to be sold, not for any fault, but simply because the owner has no further use for her. A note directed to C. D., Gadsby's Hotel, will receive prompt attention."

A sated libertine, in a land where vice is legalized, could not expose his victim with apter words.

These two instances illustrate a class.

In the recent work of Mr. Olmsted, a close observer and traveller in the Slave States, which abounds in pictures of Slavery, drawn with caution and evident regard to truth, is another, where a Slave-Master thus frankly confesses his experience: —

"'I can tell you how you can break a nigger of running away, certain,' said the Slave-Master. 'There was an old fellow I used to know in Georgia, that always cured his so. If a nigger ran away, when he caught him, he would bind his knee over a log, and fasten him so he could n't stir; then he 'd take a pair of pincers, and pull one of his toe-nails out by the roots, and tell him, that, if he ever run away again, he would pull out two of them, and if he run away again after that, he told him he 'd pull out four of them, and so on, doubling each time. He never had to do it more than twice; it always cured them.'"[1]

Like this story, from the lips of a Slave-Master, is another, where the master, angry because his slave sought to regain his God-given liberty, deliberately cut the tendons of his heel, thus horribly maiming him for life.

In vain these instances are denied. Their accumulating number, authenticated in every possible manner, by the press, by a cloud of witnesses, and by the confession of Slave-Masters, stares us constantly in the face.

Here we are brought again to the Slave Code, under the shelter of which these things, and worse, are done with complete impunity. Listen to the remarkable words of Mr. Justice Ruffin, of North Carolina, who, in a solemn decision, thus portrays, affirms, and deplores this terrible latitude. The obedience of the slave, he says, —

"is the consequence only of *uncontrolled authority over the body. . . . . The power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect.* I most freely confess my sense of the harshness of this proposition. I feel

[1] Journey through Texas, by Frederick Law Olmsted, p. 105.

it as deeply as any man can. And, as a principle of moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it. But in the actual condition of things it must be so. There is no remedy. *This discipline belongs to the state of Slavery.* . . . . It is inherent in the relation of master and slave." [1]

This same license is thus expounded in a recent judicial decision of Virginia: —

"It is the policy of the law in respect to the relation of master and slave, and for the sake of securing proper subordination and obedience on the part of the slave, *to protect the master from prosecution, even if the whipping and punishment be malicious, cruel, and excessive.*" [2]

Can Barbarism further go? Here is irresponsible power, rendered more irresponsible still by the seclusion of the plantation, and absolutely fortified by supplementary law excluding the testimony of slaves. That under its shelter enormities should occur, stranger than fiction, too terrible for imagination, and surpassing any attested experience, is simply according to the course of Nature and the course of history. Antiquity has illustrations which are most painful. From Ovid we learn how the porter was chained at his master's gate; [3] by Plautus we are introduced to the various instruments of punishment, in fearful catalogue; [4] and in the pages of the philosopher Seneca we are saddened by the cruelties of which the slave was victim. [5] A later writer, the great teacher of medicine, Galen, describes men

[1] The State *v.* Mann, 2 Devereux, North Carolina Reports, 266, 267.
[2] Souther *v.* The Commonwealth, 7 Grattan, 680.
[3] Amorum Lib. I. Eleg. VI. 1.
[4] Asinaria, Act. III. Sc. ii. 4, 5.
[5] Epist. XLVII.

knocking out the teeth of slaves with the fist, falling upon them not only with fist, but with the heels, and gouging the eyes with a pen, if at hand, as did the Emperor Adrian on one occasion;[1] while Tacitus shows how four hundred slaves in the house of an assassinated master were handed over to vindictive death.[2] St. Chrysostom portrays a mistress dragging a slave-girl by the hair, and herself applying the whip, until the cries of her bruised victim filled the whole house and penetrated the street.[3]

All this is ancient Barbarism, according to the evidence; but the analogies of life show that such things must be, where Slavery prevails. The visitation of the abbeys in England disclosed vice and disorder in startling forms, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of monastic life. A similar visitation of plantations would disclose more fearful results, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of Slavery. Every Slave-Master on his plantation is a Bashaw, with all the prerogatives of a Turk. According to Hobbes, he is a "petty king." This is true; and every plantation is of itself a petty kingdom, with more than the immunities of an abbey. Six thousand skulls of infants are reported to have been taken from a single fish-pond near a nunnery, to the dismay of Pope Gregory.[4] Under the Law of Slavery,

[1] De Animi Affectuum Dignotione et Curatione, Cap. IV.: Opera, ed. Kühn, Tom. V. p. 17.

[2] Annal. Lib. XIV. capp. 42–45. See the memoir of M. de Burigny, *Sur les Esclaves Romains:* Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, 1764–1766, Tom. XXXV. pp. 328–359.

[3] In Epist. ad Ephes. Homil. XV. 3.

[4] "Memorabile quod Ulricus epistola refert, Gregorium, quum ex piscina quadam allata plus quam sex mille infantum capita vidisset, ingemuisse." — Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part III. Sec. 2, Mem. 5, Subs. 5. He quotes Kemnicius, *Examen Concil. Trident.*, *Pars III.*, *De Cœlibatu Sacerdotum.*

infants, the offspring of masters "who dream of Freedom in a slave's embrace," are not thrown into a fish-pond, but something worse is done. They are sold. This is a single glimpse only. Slavery, in its recesses, is another Bastile, whose horrors will never be known until it shall be razed to the ground; it is the dismal castle of Giant Despair, which, when captured by the Pilgrims, excited their wonder, as they saw "the dead bodies that lay here and there in the castle-yard, and how full of dead men's bones the dungeon was." The recorded horrors of Slavery are infinite, and each day, by the escape of its victims, they are still further attested, while the door of the vast prison-house is left ajar. But, alas! unless examples of history and lessons of political wisdom are alike delusive, its unrecorded horrors must assume a form of more fearful dimensions. Baffling all attempts at description, they sink into that chapter of Sir Thomas Browne entitled "Of some Relations whose Truth we fear," and among kindred things whereof, according to this eloquent philosopher, "there remains no register but that of Hell."

If this picture of the relations of Slave-Masters with their slaves could receive any darker coloring, it would be by introducing figures of the congenial agents through which the Barbarism is maintained, — *the Slave-Overseer, the Slave-Breeder, and the Slave-Hunter,* each without a peer except in the brothers, and the whole constituting a triumvirate of Slavery, in whom its essential brutality, vulgarity, and crime are all embodied. There is the Slave-Overseer, with bloody lash, — fitly described, in his Life of Patrick Henry, by Mr. Wirt, who, born in a Slave State, knew the class, as

"last and lowest, most abject, degraded, unprincipled," [1] — and his hands wield at will the irresponsible power, being proper successor to "the devil," described by the English dramatist, who appeared

> "*in Virginia*, and commanded
> With many stripes; for that 's his cruel custom." [2]

There is next the Slave-Breeder, who assumes a higher character, even entering legislative halls, where, in unconscious insensibility, he shocks civilization by denying, like Mr. Gholson, of Virginia, any alleged distinction between the "female slave" and the "brood mare," by openly asserting the necessary respite from work during the gestation of the female slave as the ground of property in her offspring, and by proclaiming that in this "vigintial" crop of human flesh consists much of the wealth of his State, — while another Virginian, not yet hardened to this debasing trade, whose annual sacrifice reaches twenty-five thousand human souls, confesses the indignation and shame with which he beholds his State "converted into *one grand menagerie*, where men are reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles." Verily the question may be asked, Have we a Guinea among us? And, lastly, there is the Slave-Hunter, with the bloodhound as his brutal symbol, who pursues slaves as the hunter pursues game, and does not hesitate in the public prints to advertise his Barbarism thus: —

"BLOODHOUNDS. — I have TWO of the FINEST DOGS for CATCHING NEGROES in the Southwest. They can take the trail TWELVE HOURS after the NEGRO HAS PASSED, and catch him with ease. I live four miles

[1] Life and Character of Patrick Henry, Sec. II. p. 34.
[2] Massinger, The City Madam, Act V. sc. 1.

southwest of Bolivar, on the road leading from Bolivar to Whitesville. I am ready at all times to catch runaway negroes.

"DAVID TURNER.

"March 2, 1853."[1]

The bloodhound was known in early Scottish history; it was once vindictively put upon the trail of Robert Bruce, and in barbarous days, by cruel license of war, was directed against the marauders of the Scottish border. Walter Scott makes one of his heroes "cheer the dark blood-hound on his way"; but more than a century has passed since the last survivor of the race was seen in Ettrick Forest.[2] The bloodhound was employed by Spain against the natives of this continent, and the eloquence of Chatham never touched a truer chord than when, gathering force from the condemnation of this brutality, he poured his thunder upon the kindred brutality of the scalping-knife, adopted as an instrument of war by a nation professing civilization. Tardily introduced into this Republic some time after the Missouri Compromise, when Slavery became a political passion and Slave-Masters began to throw aside all disguise, the bloodhound has become the representative of our Barbarism, when engaged in the pursuit of a fellow-man asserting his inborn title to himself; and this brute becomes typical of the whole brutal leash of Slave-Hunters, who, whether at home on Slave Soil, under the name of Slave-Catchers and Kidnappers, or at a distance, under politer names, insult Human Nature by the enforcement of this Barbarism.

[1] West Tennessee Democrat.

[2] Scott, Lay of the Last Minstrel, Notes, Canto V. st. 29.

(3.) From this dreary picture of Slave-Masters with their slaves and their triumvirate of vulgar instruments, I pass to another more dreary still, and more completely exposing the influence of Slavery: I mean the *relations of Slave-Masters with each other,* also *with Society* and *Government,* — or, in other words, the Character of Slave-Masters, as displayed in the general relations of life. Here again I need your indulgence. Not in triumph or in taunt do I approach this branch of the subject. Yielding only to the irresistible exigency of the discussion, and in direct reply to the assumptions on this floor, especially by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON], I proceed. If I touch Slavery to the quick, and make Slave-Masters see themselves as others see them, I shall do nothing beyond the strictest line of duty in this debate.

One of the choicest passages of the master Italian poet, Dante, is where we are permitted to behold a passage of transcendent virtue sculptured in "visible speech" on the long gallery leading to the Heavenly Gate. The poet felt the inspiration of the scene, and placed it on the wayside, where it could charm and encourage. This was natural. Nobody can look upon virtue and justice, if only in images and pictures, without feeling a kindred sentiment. Nobody can be surrounded by vice and wrong, by violence and brutality, if only in images and pictures, without coming under their degrading influence. Nobody can live with the one without advantage; nobody can live with the other without loss. Who could pass life in the secret chamber where are gathered the impure relics of Pompeii, without becoming indifferent to loathsome things? But if these loathsome things are not merely sculptured and

painted, — if they exist in living reality, — if they enact their hideous, open indecencies, as in the criminal pretensions of Slavery, — while the lash plays and the blood spurts, — while women are whipped and children are sold, — while marriage is polluted and annulled, — while the parental tie is rudely torn, — while honest gains are filched or robbed, — while the soul itself is shut down in all the darkness of ignorance, and God himself is defied in the pretension that man can have property in his fellow-man, — if all these things are "visible," not merely in images and pictures, but in reality, the influence on character must be incalculably deplorable.

According to irresistible law men are fashioned by what is about them, whether climate, scenery, life, or institutions. Like produces like, and this ancient proverb is verified always. Look at the miner, delving low down in darkness, and the mountaineer, ranging on airy heights, and you will see a contrast in character, and even in personal form. The difference between a coward and a hero may be traced in the atmosphere which each has breathed, — and how much more in the institutions under which each is reared! If institutions generous and just ripen souls also generous and just, then other institutions must exhibit their influence also. Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all living within their fatal sphere. The meat eaten by man enters into and becomes part of his body; the madder eaten by the dog changes his bones to red; and the Slavery on which men live, in all its fivefold foulness, must become part of themselves, discoloring the very soul, blotting the character, and breaking forth in moral leprosy. This language is

strong, but the evidence is even stronger. Some there may be of happy natures — like honorable Senators — who can thus feed and not be harmed. Mithridates fed on poison, and lived. It may be that there is a moral Mithridates, who can swallow without bane the poison of Slavery.

Instead of "ennobling" the master, nothing is clearer than that the slave drags his master down; and this process, beginning in childhood, is continued through life. Living much in association with his slave, the master finds nothing to remind him of his own deficiencies, to prompt his ambition or excite his shame. He is only a little better than his predecessor in ancient Germany, as described by Tacitus, who was distinguishable from his slave by none of the charms of education, while the two burrowed among the same flocks and in the same ground.[1] Without provocation to virtue, or elevating example, he naturally shares the Barbarism of the society he keeps. Thus the very inferiority which the Slave-Master attributes to the African explains the melancholy condition of the communities in which his degradation is declared by law.

A single false principle or vicious thought may debase a character otherwise blameless; and this is practically true of the Slave-Master. Accustomed to regard men as property, the sensibilities are blunted and the moral sense is obscured. He consents to acts from which Civilization recoils. The early Church sacrificed its property, and even its sacred vessels, for the redemption of captives. On a memorable occasion this was done by St. Ambrose,[2] and successive canons confirmed

[1] "Dominum ac servum nullis educationis deliciis dignoscas. Inter eadem pecora, in eadem humo degunt." — *Germania*, c. 20.

[2] Butler, Lives of the Saints, Vol. XII. p. 114.

the example. But in the Slave States all is reversed. Slaves there are hawked as property of the Church[1]; and an instance is related of a slave sold in South Carolina to buy plate for the communion-table. Who can estimate the effect of such an example?

Surrounded by pernicious influences of all kinds, positive and negative, the first making him do that which he ought not to do, and the second making him leave undone that which he ought to have done, — through childhood, youth, and manhood, even unto age, — unable, while at home, to escape these influences, overshadowed constantly by the portentous Barbarism about him, the Slave-Master naturally adopts the bludgeon, the revolver, and the bowie-knife. Through these he governs his plantation, and secretly armed with these enters the world. These are his congenial companions. To wear these is his pride; to use them becomes a passion, almost a necessity. Nothing contributes to violence so much as wearing the instruments of violence, thus having them always at hand to obey a lawless instinct. A barbarous standard is established; the duel is not dishonorable; a contest peculiar to our Slave-Masters, known as a "street fight," is not shameful; and modern imitators of Cain have a mark set upon them, not for reproach and condemnation, but for compliment and approval. In kindred spirit, the Count of Eisenburg, presenting to Erasmus a handsome dagger, called it "the pen with which he used to combat saucy

[1] This is a natural incident of Slavery. Bishop Warburton, in a sermon before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, recounts how "a very worthy benefactor bequeathed unto us in trust, for the propagation of the Gospel, a plantation stocked with slaves," and he exclaims, "An odd legacy to the promulgators of the Law of Liberty!" — *Sermon XX.*: Works, (London, 1811,) Vol. X. p. 58.

fellows."[1] How weak that dagger against the pen of Erasmus! I wish to keep within bounds; but unanswerable facts, accumulating in fearful quantities, attest that the social system so much vaunted by honorable Senators, which we are now asked to sanction and extend, takes its character from this spirit, and, with professions of Christianity on the lips, becomes Cain-like. And this is aggravated by the prevailing ignorance in the Slave States, where one in five of the adult white population of native birth is unable to read and write.

> "The boldest they who least partake the light,
> As game-cocks in the dark are trained to fight."

There are exceptions, which we all gladly recognize; but it is this spirit which predominates and gives the social law. Again we see the lordlings of France, as pictured by Camille Desmoulins, "ordinarily very feeble in arguments, since from the cradle they are accustomed to use their *will* as right hand and their *reason* as left hand."[2] Violence ensues. And here mark an important difference. Elsewhere violence shows itself in *spite* of law, whether social or statute; in the Slave States it is *because* of law, both social and statute. Elsewhere it is pursued and condemned; in the Slave States it is adopted and honored. Elsewhere it is hunted as a crime; in the Slave States it takes its place among the honorable graces of society.

Let not these harsh statements stand on my authority. Listen to the testimony of two Governors of Slave States in messages to their respective Legislatures.

Said the Governor of Kentucky, in 1837:—

[1] Jortin, Life of Erasmus, A. D. 1532, Ætat. 65, Vol. II. p. 31.

[2] Louis Blanc, Histoire de la Révolution Française, Tom. V. p. 200.

"We long to see the day when the law will assert its majesty, and stop the wanton destruction of life which almost *daily* occurs within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. *Men slaughter each other with almost perfect impunity.* A species of Common Law has grown up in Kentucky, which, were it written down, would, in all civilized countries, cause it to be re-christened, in derision, *the Land of Blood.*"

Such was the official confession of a Slave-Master, Governor of Kentucky. And here is the official confession made the same year by the Slave-Master Governor of Alabama: —

"We hear of homicides in different parts of the State continually, and yet have few convictions, and still fewer executions. Why do we hear of *stabbings and shootings almost daily* in some part or other of our State?"

A land of blood! Stabbings and shootings almost daily! Such is official language. It was natural that contemporary newspapers should repeat what found utterance in high places. Here is the confession of a newspaper in Mississippi: —

"The moral atmosphere in our State appears to be in a *deleterious and sanguinary condition.* Almost every exchange paper which reaches us contains *some inhuman and revolting case of murder or death by violence.*" [1]

Here is another confession, by a newspaper in New Orleans: —

"In view of the crimes which are daily committed, we are led to inquire whether it is owing to the inefficiency of our laws, or to the manner in which these laws are administered,

[1] Grand Gulf Advertiser, June 27, 1837.

that this frightful deluge of human blood flows through our streets and our places of public resort." [1]

And here is testimony of a different character: —

"As I left my native State on account of Slavery, and deserted the home of my fathers to escape the sound of the lash and the shrieks of tortured victims, I would gladly bury in oblivion the recollection of those scenes with which I have been familiar; but this may not, cannot be." [2]

These are the words of a Southern lady, daughter of the accomplished Judge Grimké, of South Carolina.

A catalogue of affrays between politicians, commonly known as "street fights," — I use the phrase furnished by the land of Slavery, — would show that these authorities are not mistaken. That famous Dutch picture, admired particularly from successful engraving, and called *The Knife-Fighters*,[3] presents a scene less revolting than one of these. Two or more men, armed to the teeth, meet in the streets, at a court-house, or a tavern, shoot at each other with revolvers, then gash each other with knives, close, and roll upon the ground, covered with dirt and blood, struggling and stabbing, till death, prostration, or surrender puts an end to the conflict. Each instance tells its shameful story, and cries out against the social system tolerating such Barbarism. A catalogue of duels would testify again to the reckless disregard of life where Slavery exists, while it exhibited Violence flaunting in the garb of Honor, and prating of a barbarous code disowned equally by reason and re-

[1] New Orleans Bee, May 23, 1838.

[2] Narrative and Testimony of Sarah M. Grimké, found in the remarkable contribution to the Antislavery cause by Theodore D. Weld, American Slavery as it is, Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses, p. 22.

[3] There are two different pictures of this early scene, — one by Terburg, and the other by Adrian van Ostade, — both engraved by Suyderhoef.

ligion. But you have already surfeited with horrors, and I hasten on.

Ancient Civilization did not condemn assassination. Statues were raised to Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who slew Hipparchus. Brutus and Cassius were glorified. Modern Civilization judges otherwise; but Slavery, not content with the Duel, which was unknown to Antiquity, rejoices in assassinations also, — rejoices in both.

Pardon me, if I stop for one moment to expose and denounce the Duel. I do it only because it belongs to the brood of Slavery. Long ago an enlightened Civilization rejected this relic of Barbarism, and never was one part of the argument against it put more sententiously than by Franklin. "A duel decides nothing," said this patriot philosopher; and the person appealing to it "makes himself judge in his own cause, condemns the offender without a jury, and undertakes himself to be the executioner."[1] To these emphatic words I add two brief propositions, which, if practically adopted, make the Duel impossible: first, that the acknowledgment of wrong, with apology or explanation, can never be otherwise than honorable; and, secondly, that, in the absence of such acknowledgment, no wrong can be repaired by gladiatorial contest, where brute force, or skill, or chance must decide the day. Iron and adamant are not stronger than these arguments; nor can any one attempt an answer without exposing his feebleness. And yet Slave-Masters, disregarding its irrational character, insensible to its folly, heedless of its impiety, and unconscious of its Barbarism, openly adopt the Duel as

[1] Letter to Thomas Percival, July 17, 1784: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 108.

regulator of manners and conduct. Two voices from South Carolina have been raised against it, and I mention them with gladness as testimony from that land of Slavery. The first was Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who, in the early days of the Republic, after asking if there were "no way of abolishing throughout the Union this absurd and *barbarous* custom," invoked the clergy of his State, "as a particular favor, at some convenient early day, to preach a sermon on the sin and folly of duelling."[1] The other was Mr. Rhett, who, on this floor, openly declared, as his reason for declining the Duel, "that he feared God more than man."[2] Generous words, for which many errors will be pardoned. But these voices condemn the social system of which the Duel is a natural product.

Looking at the broad surface of society where Slavery exists, we find its spirit actively manifest against all freedom of speech and the press, especially with regard to this wrong. Nobody in the Slave States can speak or print plainly about Slavery, except at peril of life or liberty; and a curious instance shows how this same spirit is carried by our Slave-Masters into foreign lands. As early as 1789, and in Paris, a poor play,[3] where Slavery was painted truthfully, excited the hostility of what Baron Grimm, who reports the incident, calls "an American cabal," so that its failure was attributed by some to this influence, being the early prototype of that so strong among us. St. Paul could call upon the people of Athens to give up the worship of unknown

[1] Sabine, Notes on Duels and Duelling, pp. 322, 324.

[2] Speech in the Senate, February 28, 1852: Congressional Globe, 32d Cong. 1st Sess., p. 655.

[3] L'Esclavage des Nègres, ou l'Heureux Naufrage. See Grimm, Correspondance, Tom. XVI. pp. 328, 329, Décembre, 1789.

gods; he could live in his own hired house at Rome, and preach Christianity in this Heathen metropolis; but no man can be heard against Slavery in Charleston or Mobile. We condemn the Inquisition, which subjects all within its influence to censorship and secret judgment; but this tyranny is repeated in American Slave-Masters. Truths as simple as the great discovery of Galileo are openly denied, and all who declare them are driven to recant. We condemn the "Index Expurgatorius" of the Roman Church; but American Slave-Masters have an Index where are inscribed all the generous books of the age. One book, the marvel of recent literature, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," is treated thus by the Church as by Slave-Masters, being honored by the same suppression at the Vatican as at Charleston.

Not to dwell on these instances, there is one which has a most instructive ridiculousness. A religious discourse of the late Dr. Channing on West India Emancipation — the last effort of his beautiful life — was offered for sale by a book agent at Charleston. A prosecution by the South Carolina Association ensued, and the agent was held to bail in the sum of one thousand dollars. Shortly afterward, the same agent received for sale a work by Dickens, "American Notes," freshly published; but, determined not to expose himself again to the tyrannical Inquisition, he gave notice through the newspapers that the book would "be submitted to highly intelligent members of the South Carolina Association for *inspection*, and *if* the sale is approved by them, it will be for sale, — if not, not." [1]

[1] Address to the Inhabitants of New Mexico and California, by William Jay: Miscellaneous Writings, p. 536.

Listen also to another recent instance, as recounted in the "Montgomery Mail," a newspaper of Alabama.

"Last Saturday we devoted to the flames a large number of copies of Spurgeon's Sermons, and the pile was graced at the top with a copy of 'Graves's Great Iron Wheel,' which a Baptist friend presented for the purpose. We trust that the works of the greasy cockney vociferator may receive the same treatment throughout the South. And if the Pharisaical author should ever show himself in these parts, we trust that a stout cord may speedily find its way around his eloquent throat. He has proved himself a dirty, low-bred slanderer, and ought to be treated accordingly."

Very recently we had the opportunity of reading in the journals, that the trustees of a college in Alabama resolved against Dr. Wayland's admirable work on Moral Science, as containing "Abolition doctrine of the deepest dye," and proceeded to denounce "the said book, and forbid its further use in the Institute."

The speeches of Wilberforce in the British Parliament, and especially those magnificent efforts of Brougham, where he exposed "the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man," were insanely denounced by the British planters in the West Indies; but our Slave-Masters go further. Speeches delivered in the Senate are stopped at the Post-Office; booksellers receiving them have been mobbed; and on at least one occasion the speeches were solemnly proceeded against by a Grand Jury.[1]

All this is natural, for tyranny is condemned to be consistent with itself. Proclaim Slavery a permanent institution, instead of a temporary Barbarism, soon to

[1] This was the case with Mr. Sumner's speech, "The Crime against Kansas." More than one person found with a copy of this speech was compelled to flee.

pass away, and then, by the unhesitating logic of self-preservation, all things must yield to its support. The safety of Slavery becomes the supreme law. And since Slavery is endangered by Liberty in any form, therefore all Liberty must be restrained. Such is the philosophy of this seeming paradox in a Republic. And our Slave-Masters show themselves apt. Violence and brutality are their ready instruments, quickened always by the wakefulness of suspicion, and perhaps often by the restlessness of uneasy conscience. The Lion's Mouth of Venice is open everywhere in the Slave States; nor are wanting the gloomy cells and the Bridge of Sighs.

This spirit has recently shown itself with such intensity and activity as to constitute what is properly termed a Reign of Terror. Northern men, unless recognized as delegates to a Democratic Convention, are exposed in their travels, whether for business or health. They are watched and dogged, as in a land of Despotism, — are treated with the meanness of disgusting tyranny, — and live in peril always of personal indignity, often of life and limb. Complaint is sometimes made of wrongs to American citizens in Mexico; but the last year witnessed outrages on American citizens perpetrated in the Slave States exceeding those in Mexico. Here, again, I have no time for details, already presented in other quarters. Instances are from all conditions of life and in various quarters. In Missouri, a Methodist clergyman, suspected of being an Abolitionist, was taken to prison, amidst threats of tar and feathers. In Arkansas, a schoolmaster was driven from the State. In Kentucky, a plain citizen from Indiana, on a visit to his friends, was threatened with death by the rope. In Alabama, a simple person from Connecticut, peddling

books, was thrust into prison, amidst cries of "Shoot him! Hang him!" In Virginia, a Shaker, from New York, peddling garden-seeds, was forcibly expelled from the State. In Georgia, a merchant's clerk, Irish by birth, who simply asked the settlement of a just debt, was cast into prison, robbed of his pocket-book containing nearly one hundred dollars, and barely escaped with life. In South Carolina, a stone-cutter, also an Irishman, was stripped naked, and then, amidst cries of "Brand him!" "Burn him!" "Spike him to death!" scourged so that blood came at every stroke, while tar was poured upon the lacerated flesh. These atrocities, calculated, according to the words of a great poet, to "make a holiday in Hell," were all ordained by Vigilance Committees, or that swiftest magistrate, Judge Lynch, inspired by the demon of Slavery.

> "He let them loose, and cried, Halloo!
> How shall we yield him honor due?"[1]

In perfect shamelessness, and as if to blazon this fiendish spirit, we have this winter had an article in a leading newspaper of Virginia, offering twenty-five dollars each for the heads of citizens, mostly Members of Congress, known to be against Slavery, with fifty thousand dollars for the head of William H. Seward. In still another paper of Virginia we find a proposition to raise ten thousand dollars for the kidnapping, and delivery at Richmond, of a venerable citizen, Joshua R. Giddings, "or five thousand dollars for the production of his head." These are fresh instances, but not alone. At a meeting of Slave-Masters in Georgia, in 1836, the Governor was recommended to issue a proclamation offering five thousand dollars as a reward for the ap-

[1] Coleridge, Fire, Famine, and Slaughter.

prehension of *either* of ten persons named in the resolution, citizens of New York and Massachusetts, and one a subject of Great Britain, — neither of whom was it pretended had ever set foot on the soil of Georgia. The Milledgeville "Federal Union," a newspaper of Georgia, in 1836, contained an offer of ten thousand dollars for kidnapping a clergyman residing in the city of New York. A Committee of Vigilance in Louisiana, in 1835, offered, in the "Louisiana Journal," fifty thousand dollars to any person who would deliver into their hands Arthur Tappan, a liberty-loving merchant of New York; and during the same year a public meeting in Alabama, with a person entitled "Honorable" in the chair, offered a similar reward of fifty thousand dollars for the apprehension of the same Arthur Tappan, and of La Roy Sunderland, a clergyman of the Methodist Church in New York.

These manifestations are not without example in the history of the Antislavery cause elsewhere. From the beginning, Slave-Masters have encountered argument by brutality and violence. St. Jerome had before him their type, when he described certain persons "whose words are in their fists and syllogisms in their heels."[1] If we go back to the earliest of Abolitionists, the wonderful Portuguese preacher, Vieyra, we find that his matchless eloquence and unquestioned piety did not save him from indignity. The good man was seized and imprisoned, while one of the principal Slave-Masters asked him, in mockery, "where were all his learning and all his genius now, if they could not deliver him in this extremity?"[2] He was of the Catholic Church. But

[1] "Quorum verba in pugnis sunt, et syllogismi in calcibus."

[2] Southey, History of Brazil, Vol. II. ch. 27, p. 536.

the spirit of Slavery is the same in all churches. A renowned Quaker minister of the last century, Thomas Chalkley, while on a visit at Barbadoes, having simply recommended charity to the slaves, without presuming to breathe a word against Slavery itself, was first met by disturbance in the meeting, and afterward, on the highway, in open day, was shot at by one of the exasperated planters, with a fowling-piece "loaded with small shot, ten of which made marks, and several drew blood."[1] In England, while the Slave-Trade was under discussion, the same spirit raged. Wilberforce, who represented the cause of Abolition in Parliament, was threatened with personal violence; Clarkson, who represented the same cause before the people, was assaulted by the infuriate Slave-Traders, and narrowly escaped being hustled into the dock; and Roscoe, the accomplished historian, on return to Liverpool from his seat in Parliament, where he had signalized himself as an opponent of the Slave-Trade, was met at the entrance of the town by a savage mob, composed of persons interested in the traffic, armed with *knives and bludgeons*, the distinctive arguments and companions of the partisans of Slavery.

Even in the Free States, these same partisans from the beginning acted under the inspiration of violence. The demon of Slavery entered into them, and through its influence they have behaved like Slave-Masters. Public meetings for the discussion of Slavery have been interrupted; public halls, dedicated to its discussion, have been destroyed or burned to the ground. In all our populous cities the great rights of speech and of the press have been assailed precisely as in the Slave

[1] Journal of Thomas Chalkley, p. 274.

States. In Boston, an early and most devoted Abolitionist was dragged through the streets with a halter about his neck; and in Illinois, another, while defending his press, was ferociously murdered. The former yet lives to speak for himself, while the latter lives in his eloquent brother, a Representative from Illinois in the other House.[1] Thus does Slavery show its natural character even at a distance.

Nor in the Slave States is this spirit confined to outbreaks of mere lawlessness. Too strong for restraint, it finds no limitations except in its own barbarous will. The Government becomes its tool, and in *official acts* does its bidding. Here again the instances are numerous. I might dwell on the degradation of the Post-Office, when its official head consented that for the sake of Slavery the mails themselves should be rifled. I might dwell also on the cruel persecution of free persons of color, who, in the Slave States generally, and even here in the District of Columbia, are not allowed to testify where a white man is in question, and now in several States are menaced by legislative act with the alternative of expulsion from their homes or of reduction to Slavery. But I pass to two illustrative transactions, which a son of Massachusetts can never forget.

1. The first relates to a citizen of purest life and perfect integrity, whose name is destined to fill a conspicuous place in the history of Freedom, William Lloyd Garrison. Born in Massachusetts, bred to the same profession with Benjamin Franklin, and, like his great predecessor, becoming an editor, he saw with instinctive clearness the wrong of Slavery, and, at a period when

[1] Hon. Owen Lovejoy, who died March 25, 1864.

the ardors of the Missouri Question had given way to indifference throughout the North, he stepped forward to denounce it. The jail at Baltimore, where he then resided, was the earliest reward. Afterward, January 1st, 1831, he published the first number of "The Liberator," inscribing for his motto an utterance of Christian philanthropy, "Our country is the world, our countrymen are mankind," and declaring, in the face of surrounding apathy: "I am in earnest, — I will not equivocate, — I will not excuse, — I will not retreat a single inch, — AND I WILL BE HEARD." In this sublime spirit he commenced his labors for the Slave, proposing no intervention by Congress in the States, and on well-considered principle avoiding all appeals to the bondmen themselves. Such was his simple and thoroughly constitutional position, when, before the expiration of the first year, the Legislature of Georgia, by solemn act, a copy of which I have before me, "approved" by Wilson Lumpkin, Governor, appropriated five thousand dollars "to be paid to any person or persons who shall arrest, bring to trial, and prosecute to conviction under the laws of this State, the editor or publisher of a certain paper called *The Liberator*, published in the town of Boston and State of Massachusetts."[1] This infamous statute, touching a citizen absolutely beyond the jurisdiction of Georgia and in no way amenable to its laws, constituted a plain bribe to the gangs of kidnappers engendered by Slavery. With this barefaced defiance of justice and decency Slave-Masters inaugurated the system of violence by which they have sought to crush every voice raised against Slavery.

[1] Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1831, December 26, p. 256.

2. Here is another illustration, of a different character. Free persons of color, citizens of Massachusetts, and, according to the institutions of this Commonwealth, entitled to equal privileges with other citizens, being in service as mariners, and touching at the port of Charleston, in South Carolina, have been seized, and, with no allegation against them, except of entering this port in the discharge of their rightful business, have been cast into prison, and there detained during the stay of the vessel. This is by virtue of a statute of South Carolina, passed in 1822, which further declares, that, in the failure of the captain to pay the expenses, these freemen "shall be deemed and taken as absolute slaves," one moiety of the proceeds of their sale to belong to the sheriff. Against all remonstrance, — against the official opinion of Mr. Wirt, as Attorney-General of the United States, declaring it unconstitutional, — against the solemn judgment of Mr. Justice Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, himself a Slave-Master and citizen of South Carolina, also pronouncing it unconstitutional,[1] — this statute, which is an obvious injury to Northern ship-owners, as it is an outrage to the mariners whom it seizes, has been upheld to this day by South Carolina.

Massachusetts, anxious to obtain for her people that protection which was denied, and especially to save them from the dread penalty of being sold into Slavery, appointed a citizen of South Carolina as her agent for this purpose, and in her behalf to bring suits in the Circuit Court of the United States to try the constitutionality of this pretension. Owing to the sensitiveness

[1] Report of Committee of U. S. House of Representatives, 27th Cong. 2d Sess., No. 80, January 20, 1843.

of the people in that State, the agent declined to render this simple service. Massachusetts next selected one of her own sons, a venerable citizen, who had already served with honor in the other House of Congress, and was of admitted eminence as a lawyer, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, of Concord, to visit Charleston, and there do what the agent first appointed shrank from doing. This excellent gentleman, beloved by all who knew him, gentle in manners as he was firm in character, with a countenance that was in itself a letter of recommendation, arrived at Charleston, accompanied only by his daughter. Straightway all South Carolina was convulsed. According to a story in Boswell's Johnson, all the inhabitants at St. Kilda, a remote island of the Hebrides, on the approach of a stranger, "catch cold"[1]; but in South Carolina it is fever that they catch. The Governor at the time, who was none other than one of her present Senators [Mr. HAMMOND], made his arrival the subject of special message to the Legislature, which I have before me; the Legislature all caught the fever, and swiftly adopted resolutions calling upon his Excellency the Governor "to expel from our territory the said agent, after due notice to depart," and promising to "sustain the Executive authority in any measures it may adopt for the purpose aforesaid."

Meanwhile the fever raged in Charleston. The agent of Massachusetts was first accosted in the streets by a person unknown to him, who, flourishing a bludgeon in his hand, — the bludgeon always shows itself where Slavery is in question, — cried out: "You had better be travelling, and the sooner the better for you, I can

[1] Boswell's Life of Johnson, October 2, 1773, ed. Croker, (London, 1835,) Vol. IV. p. 311. See also, anno 1768, Vol. III. pp. 41, 42.

tell you; if you stay here until to-morrow morning, you will feel something you will not like, I 'm thinking." Next came threats of attack during the following night on the hotel where he was lodged; then a request from the landlord that he should quit, in order to preserve the hotel from the impending danger of an infuriate mob; then a committee of Slave-Masters, who politely proposed to conduct him to the boat. Thus arrested in his simple errand of good-will, this venerable public servant, whose appearance alone, like that of the "grave and pious man" mentioned by Virgil, would have softened any mob not inspired by Slavery, yielded to the ejectment proposed, precisely as the prisoner yields to the officers of the law, and left Charleston, while a person in the crowd was heard to declare that he "had offered himself as a leader of a tar-and-feather gang, to have been called into the service of the city on the occasion." Nor is this all. The Legislature a second time caught the fever, and, yielding to its influence, passed a statute, forbidding, under severe penalties, any person within the State from accepting a commission to befriend these colored mariners, and, under penalties severer still, extending even to unlimited imprisonment, prohibiting any person, "on his own behalf, or under color or in virtue of any commission or authority from any State or public authority of any State in this Union, or of any foreign power," to come into South Carolina for this purpose; and then, to complete its work, by still another statute took away the writ of *Habeas Corpus* from all such mariners.[1]

[1] Massachusetts Senate Documents, 1845, No. 4. Acts of the General Assembly of South Carolina, 1844, December 18: Statutes at Large, Vol. XI. pp. 292, 293.

Such is a simple narrative, founded on authentic documents. I do not adduce it for present criticism, but simply to enroll it in all its stages — beginning with the earliest pretension of South Carolina, continuing in violence, and ending in yet other pretensions — among the special instances where the Barbarism of Slavery stands confessed even in official conduct. And yet this transaction, which may well give to South Carolina the character of a shore "where shipwrecked mariners dread to land," was openly vindicated in all its details, from beginning to end, by both the Senators from that State, while one of them [Mr. HAMMOND], in the same breath, bore testimony from personal knowledge to the character of the public agent thus maltreated, saying, "He was a pleasant, kind old gentleman, well informed, and I had a sort of friendship for him during the short time that I sat near him in Congress." [1]

Thus, Sir, whether we look at individuals or at the community where Slavery exists, at lawless outbreaks or at official conduct, Slave-Masters are always the same. Enough, you will say, has been told. Yes, enough to expose Slavery, but not enough for Truth. The most instructive and most grievous part still remains. It is the exhibition of Slave-Masters in Congressional history. Of course, the representative reflects the character as well as the political opinions of the constituents whose will it is his boast to obey. It follows that the passions and habits of Slave-Masters are naturally represented in Congress, — chastened to a certain extent, perhaps, by the requirements of Parliamentary Law, but breaking out in fearful examples. And here, again, facts speak as nothing else can.

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 595, January 26, 1860.

In proceeding with this duty, to which, as you will perceive, I am impelled by the positive requirements of this debate, I crave indulgence of the Senate, while, avoiding all allusions to private life or private character, and touching simply what is of record, and already "enrolled in the Capitol," I present a few only of many instances, which, especially during these latter days, since Slavery became paramount, have taken their place in our national history. Clarendon has mildly pictured successive Congresses, when, recounting what preceded the Civil War in England, he says: "It is not to be denied that there were in all those Parliaments .... several passages and distempered speeches of particular persons, not fit for the dignity and honor of those places."[1] But Congress, under the rule of Slavery, has been worse than any Parliament.

Here is an instance. On the 13th of February, 1837, R. M. Whitney was arraigned before the House of Representatives for contempt, in refusing to attend, when required, before a committee investigating the administration of the Executive office. His excuse was, that "he could not attend without exposing himself thereby to outrage and violence" in the committee-room; and on examination at the bar of the House, Mr. Fairfield, a member of the Committee, afterward a member of this body, and Governor of Maine, testified to the actual facts. It appeared that Mr. Peyton, a Slave-Master from Tennessee, and a member of the Committee, regarding a certain answer in writing by Mr. Whitney to an interrogatory propounded by him as offensive, broke out in these words: "Mr. Chairman, I wish you to inform this witness that he is not to insult me in his

[1] History of the Rebellion, Book I. Vol. I. pp. 8, 9, Oxford, 1826.

answers; if he does, God damn him, I will take his life upon the spot!" Mr. Wise, another Slave-Master, from Virginia, Chairman of the Committee, and latterly Governor of Virginia, then intervened, saying, "Yes, this damned insolence is insufferable." The witness, thereupon rising, claimed the protection of the Committee; on which Mr. Peyton exclaimed: "God damn you, you shan't speak; you shan't say a word while you are in this room; if you do, I will put you to death!" Soon after, Mr. Peyton, observing that the witness was looking at him, cried out: "Damn him, his eyes are on me; God damn him, he is looking at me; he shan't do it; damn him, he shan't look at me!" These things, and much more, disclosed by Mr. Fairfield, in reply to interrogatories in the House, were confirmed by other witnesses; and Mr. Wise himself, in a speech, made the admission that he was armed with deadly weapons, saying: "I watched the motion of that right arm [of the witness], the elbow of which could be seen by me; and had it moved one inch, he had died on the spot. That was my determination."

All this will be found in the thirteenth volume of the "Congressional Debates," with the evidence in detail, and the discussion thereupon.

Here is another instance, of similar character, which did not occur in a committee-room, but during debate in the Senate Chamber. While the Compromise Measures were under discussion, on the 17th of April, 1850, Mr. Foote, a Slave-Master from Mississippi, in the course of remarks, commenced personal allusion to Mr. Benton. This was aggravated by the circumstance that only a few days previously he had made this distinguished gentleman the mark for most bitter and vin-

dictive personalities. Mr. Benton rose at once from his seat, and, with angry countenance, but without weapon of any kind in his hand, or, as appeared afterward before the Committee, on his person, advanced in the direction of Mr. Foote, when the latter, gliding backward, drew from his pocket a five-chambered revolver, full-loaded, which he cocked. Meanwhile Mr. Benton, at the suggestion of friends, was already returning to his seat, when he perceived the pistol. Excited greatly by this deadly menace, he exclaimed: "I am not armed. I have no pistols. I disdain to carry arms. Stand out of the way, and let the assassin fire." Mr. Foote remained standing in the position he had taken, with pistol in hand, cocked. "Soon after," says the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate this occurrence, "both Senators resumed their seats, and order was restored."

This will be found at length in the twenty-first volume of the "Congressional Globe."[1]

I cite yet another instance from the same authentic record. Mr. Arnold, of Tennessee, had proclaimed himself as "belonging to the Peace party," when Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, coming to his seat, called him "a damned coward," "a damned blackguard," and then said, that, if Mr. Arnold did not behave better, "he would cut his throat from ear to ear."[2]

The Duel, which at home in the Slave States is "twin" with the "street fight," is also "twin" with these instances. It is constantly adopted or attempted by Slave-Masters in Congress. But I shall not enter

[1] See also Senate Reports, 31st Cong. 1st Sess., No. 170.

[2] Speech of Mr. Arnold, January 27, 1841: Congressional Globe, Vol. XI. p. 182. See also Address to the Inhabitants of New Mexico and California, by William Jay: Miscellaneous Writings, p. 515.

upon this catalogue. I content myself with showing the openness with which it has been menaced in debate, and without any call to order.

Mr. Foote, the same Slave-Master already mentioned, in debate in the Senate, the 26th of March, 1850, thus sought to provoke Mr. Benton. I take his words from the "Congressional Globe," Vol. XXI. p. 603.

"There are incidents in his [Mr. Benton's] history, of somewhat recent occurrence, which might well relieve any man of honor from the obligation to recognize him as a fitting antagonist; yet is it, notwithstanding, true, that, if the Senator from Missouri will deign to acknowledge himself *responsible to the laws of honor*, he shall have a very early opportunity of proving his prowess in contest with one over whom I hold perfect control; or, if he feels in the least degree aggrieved at anything which has fallen from me, now or formerly, he shall, on demanding it, *have full redress accorded him*, according to the said laws of honor. I do not denounce him as a coward; such language is unfitted for this audience; but, if he wishes to patch up his reputation for courage, now greatly on the wane, he will certainly *have an opportunity of doing so, whenever he makes known his desire in the premises.* At present he is shielded by his age, *his open disavowal of the obligatory force of the laws of honor*, and his Senatorial privileges."

With such bitter taunts and reiterated provocations to the Duel was Mr. Benton pursued; but there was no call to order, nor any action of the Senate on this outrage.

I give another instance. In debate in the Senate on the 27th February, 1852, Mr. Clemens, a Slave-Master of Alabama, thus directly attacked Mr. Rhett for undertaking to settle their differences by argument in the Senate rather than by the Duel. "No man,"

said he, "with the feeling of a man in his bosom, would have sought redress here. He would have looked for it *elsewhere*. He now comes here, not to ask redress in the only way he should have sought it."[1] There was no call to order.

Here is still another. In the debate on the Bill for the Improvement of Rivers and Harbors, 29th July, 1854, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN], who is still a member of this body, ardent for Slavery, while professing to avoid personal altercation in the Senate, especially "with a gentleman who professes the principles of non-resistance, as he understood the Senator from New York does," proceeded most earnestly to repel an imagined imputation on him by Mr. Seward, and wound up by saying, "If it came from another quarter, *it would not be upon this floor that I should answer it.*"[2]

During the present session, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS], who speaks so often for Slavery, in a colloquy on this floor with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. COLLAMER], maintained the Duel as a mode of settling personal differences, and vindicating what is called personal honor, — as if personal honor did not depend absolutely upon what a man does, and not on what is done to him. After certain refinements on the imagined relations between an insult and the obligation to answer for it, the Senator declared, in reply to the Senator from Vermont, that, in case of insult, taking another out and shooting him might be "satisfaction."[3]

I do not dwell on this instance, nor on any of these

[1] Congressional Globe, 32d Cong. 1st Sess., p. 647.
[2] Ibid., 33d Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 1163.
[3] Ibid., 36th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 1686.

instances, except to make a single comment. These declarations have all been made in open Senate, without any check from the Chair. Of course, they are clear violations of the first principles of Parliamentary Law, and tend directly to provoke a violation of the law of the land. Here, in the District of Columbia, all duels are prohibited by solemn Act of Congress.[1] In case of death, the surviving parties are declared guilty of felony, to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary; and even where nothing has occurred beyond the challenge, all the parties to it, whether givers, receivers, or bearers, are declared guilty of high crime and misdemeanor, also to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary. Of course, every menace of duel in Congress sets this law at defiance. And yet Senators, who thus openly disregard a law sanctioned by the Constitution and commended by morality, presume to complain on this floor because other Senators disregard the Fugitive Slave Bill, a statute which, according to the profound convictions of large numbers, is as unconstitutional as it is offensive to the moral sense. Let Senators, whose watchword is "the enforcement of laws," begin by enforcing the statute which declares the Duel to be felony. At least, let the statute cease to be a dead letter in this Chamber, where the watchword is so often heard. But this is too much to expect while Slavery prevails here; for the Duel is part of that System of Violence which has its origin in Slavery.

It is when aroused by the Slave Question in Congress that Slave-Masters have most truly shown themselves; and here again I shall speak only of what has already passed into history. Slavery is a perpetual

[1] Act of February 20, 1839: Statutes at Large, Vol. V. p. 318.

fever-and-ague, under which Congress has shaken with alternate heats and chills. Even in that earliest debate, in the first Congress after the Constitution, on the memorial of Dr. Franklin, simply calling upon Congress to "step to the verge of its power to discourage every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men,"[1] the Slave-Masters became angry, indulged in sneers at "the men in the gallery" being Quakers and Abolitionists, and, according to the faithful historian, Hildreth,[2] poured out "torrents of abuse," while one of them began the charge so often since directed against all Antislavery men, by declaring his astonishment that Dr. Franklin had "given countenance" to "an application which called upon Congress, in explicit terms, to break a solemn compact to which he had himself been a party," when it was obvious that Dr. Franklin had done no such thing. The great man was soon summoned away by death, but not until he had fastened upon this debate an undying condemnation, by portraying, with matchless pen, a scene in the Divan at Algiers, where a Corsair Slave-Dealer, insisting upon the enslavement of White Christians, is made to repeat the Congressional speech of an American Slave-Master.[3]

These displays of Violence naturally increase with the intensity of the discussion. Impelled to be severe, but with little appreciation of debate in its finer forms, they cannot be severe except by violating the rules of debate, — not knowing that there is a serener power than any found in personalities, and that all severity transcending the rules of debate becomes disgusting as the utterance of a Yahoo, and harms him only who

[1] Annals of Congress, 1st Cong. 2d Sess., col. 1198.
[2] History of the United States, Vol. IV. Ch. 2.
[3] Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. II. pp. 517–521.

degrades himself to be its mouthpiece. Of course, on such occasions, amidst all seeming triumphs, the cause of Slavery loses, and Truth gains. If men cannot afford to be decent, they ought to suspect the justice of their cause, or at least the motives with which they sustain it; but our Slave-Masters, not seeing the indecency of their conduct, know not their losses. There is waste as well as economy of character; but the latter is found only in the cultivation of those principles which make Slavery impossible.

Against John Quincy Adams this violence was first directed in full force. To a character spotless as snow, and to universal attainments as a scholar, this illustrious citizen added experience in all the eminent posts of the Republic, which he had filled with an ability and integrity now admitted even by enemies, and which impartial history can never forget. Having been President of the United States, he entered the House of Representatives at the period when the Slave Question, in its revival, first began to occupy public attention. In all the completeness of his nature, he became the representative of Human Freedom. The first struggle occurred on the Right of Petition, which Slave-Masters, with characteristic tyranny, sought to suppress. This was resisted by the venerable patriot, and what he did was always done with his whole heart. Then was poured upon him abuse "as from a cart," according to a famous phrase of Demosthenes. Slave-Masters, "foaming out their shame," became conspicuous, not less for the avowal of sentiments at which Civilization blushed than for an effrontery of manner where the accidental legislator was lost in the natural overseer, and the lash of the plantation resounded in the voice.

In an address to his constituents, September 17, 1842, Mr. Adams thus frankly describes the treatment he experienced: —

"I never can take part in any debate upon an important subject, be it only upon a mere abstraction, but a pack opens upon me of personal invective in return. Language has no word of reproach and railing that is not hurled at me."

And in the same speech he shows us Slave-Masters: —

"Where the South cannot effect her object by browbeating, she wheedles."

On another occasion, he announced, with accustomed power: —

"Insult, bullying, and threat characterize the Slaveholders in Congress; talk, timidity, and submission, the Representatives from the Free States."

Nor were the Slave-Masters content with violence of words, or with ejaculation of personalities by which debate became a perpetual syringe of liquid foulness, and every one seemed to vie with Squirt the apothecary, according to the verse admired by Pope, —

"Such zeal he had for that vile utensil." [1]

True to the instincts of Slavery, they threatened personal indignity of every kind, and even assassination. And here South Carolina naturally took the lead.

The "Charleston Mercury," which always speaks the true voice of Slavery, said in 1837: —

"Public opinion in the South would now, we are sure, justify an immediate resort to force by the Southern dele-

[1] Garth, The Dispensary, Canto II. 223.

gation, *even on the floor of Congress*, were they forthwith to seize and drag from the Hall any man who dared to insult them. as that eccentric old showman, John Quincy Adams, has dared to do."

And at a public dinner at Walterborough, in South Carolina, on the 4th of July, 1842, the following toast, afterwards preserved by Mr. Adams in one of his speeches, was drunk with unbounded applause: —

"May we never want a Democrat to trip up the heels of a Federalist, or a hangman to prepare a halter for John Quincy Adams! [*Nine cheers.*]"

A Slave-Master from South Carolina, Mr. Waddy Thompson, in debate in the House of Representatives, threatened the venerable patriot with the "penitentiary"; and another Slave-Master, Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky, insisted that he should be "*silenced.*" Ominous word! full of incentive to the bludgeon-bearers of Slavery. But the great representative of Freedom stood firm. Meanwhile Slavery assumed more and more the port of Giant Maul in "Pilgrim's Progress," who continued with his club breaking skulls, until he was slain by Mr. Great-Heart, soon to join the congenial pilgrims, Mr. Honest, Mr. Valiant-for-Truth, and Mr. Standfast.

Next to John Quincy Adams, no person in Congress has been more conspicuous for long-continued and patriotic services against Slavery than Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; nor have any such services received in higher degree that homage found in the personal and most vindictive assaults of Slave-Masters. For more than twenty years he sat in the House of Representatives, bearing his testimony austerely, and never shrinking,

though exposed to the grossest brutality. In a recent address at New York he has recounted some of these instances.

On his presentation of resolutions affirming that Slavery was a local institution and could not exist outside of the Slave States, and applying this principle to the case of the "Creole," the House caught the South Carolina fever. A proposition of censure was introduced by Slave-Masters, and under the previous question pressed to a vote, without giving him a moment for explanation or reply. This glaring outrage upon freedom of debate was redressed by the constituency of Mr. Giddings, who without delay returned him to his seat. From that time the rage of the Slave-Masters against him was constant. Here is his own brief account.

"I will not speak of the time when Dawson, of Louisiana, drew a bowie-knife for my assassination. I was afterward speaking with regard to a certain transaction in which negroes were concerned in Georgia, when Mr. Black, of Georgia, raising his bludgeon, and standing in front of my seat, said to me, 'If you repeat that language again, I will knock you down.' It was a solemn moment for me. I had never been knocked down, and, having some curiosity upon that subject, I repeated the language. Then Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, the same who had drawn the bowie-knife, placed his hand in his pocket and said, with an oath which I will not repeat, that he would shoot me, at the same time cocking the pistol, so that all around me could hear it click."

Listening to these horrors, ancient stories of Barbarism are all outdone; and the "viper broth," which was a favorite decoction in a barbarous age, seems to be the daily drink of American Slave-Masters. The blas-

pheming madness of the witches in "Macbeth" is renewed, and they dance again round the caldron, dropping into it "sweltered venom sleeping got," with every other "charm of powerful trouble." Men are transformed into wolves, as according to early Greek superstition, and a new lycanthropy has its day. But Mr. Giddings, strong in consciousness of right, knew the dignity of his position. He knew that it is always honorable to serve the cause of Liberty, and that it is a privilege to suffer for this cause. Reproach, contumely, violence even unto death, are rewards, not punishments; and clearly the indignities you offer can excite no shame except for their authors.

Besides these eminent instances, others may be mentioned, showing the personalities to which Senators and Representatives are exposed, when undertaking to speak for Freedom. And truth compels me to add, that it would be easy to show how these are grossly aggravated towards individuals who notoriously reject the Duel; for then they can be offered with personal impunity.

Here is an instance. In 1848, Mr. Hale, the Senator from New Hampshire, who still continues an honor to this body, introduced into the Senate a bill for the protection of property in the District of Columbia, especially against mob-violence, when, in the debate that ensued, Mr. Foote, a Slave-Master from Mississippi, thus menaced him:—

"I invite the Senator to the good State of Mississippi, and will tell him beforehand, in all honesty, that he could not go ten miles into the interior before he would grace one of the tallest trees of the forest with a rope around his neck, with the approbation of every virtuous and patriotic citizen, and that, if necessary, *I should myself assist in the operation.*" [1]

[1] Congressional Globe, 30th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 502.

That this bloody threat may not seem to stand alone, I add two others.

In 1836, Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, now a Senator, is reported as saying in the House of Representatives: —

"I warn the Abolitionists, ignorant, infatuated barbarians as they are, that, if chance shall throw any of them into our hands, he may expect *a felon's death!*" [1]

In 1841, Mr. Payne, a Slave-Master from Alabama, in the course of debate in the House of Representatives, alluding to the Abolitionists, among whom he insisted the Postmaster-General ought to be included, declared that

"He would put the brand of Cain upon them, — yes, the mark of Hell; and if they came to the South, he would *hang them like dogs.*" [2]

And these words were applied to men who simply expressed the recorded sentiments of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

Even during the present session of Congress, I find in the "Congressional Globe" the following interruptions of the eloquent and faithful Representative from Illinois, Mr. Lovejoy, when speaking on Slavery. I do not characterize them, but simply cite the language.

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi: —

"Order that black-hearted scoundrel and nigger-stealing thief to take his seat."

By Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, addressing Mr. Lovejoy: —

"Then behave yourself."

[1] Congressional Globe, 24th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 567.
[2] Ibid., 27th Cong. 1st Sess., p. 387.

By Mr. Gartrell, of Georgia (in his seat): —

"The man is crazy."

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi, again: —

"No, Sir, you stand there to-day an infamous, perjured villain."

By Mr. Ashmore, of South Carolina: —

"Yes, he is a perjured villain; and he perjures himself every hour he occupies a seat on this floor."

By Mr. Singleton, of Mississippi: —

"And a negro-thief into the bargain."

By Mr. Barksdale, of Mississippi, again: —

"I hope my colleague will hold no parley with that perjured negro-thief."

By Mr. Singleton, of Mississippi, again: —

"No, Sir! any gentleman shall have time, but not such a mean, despicable wretch as that!"

By Mr. Martin, of Virginia: —

"And if you come among us, we will do with you as we did with John Brown, — hang you up as high as Haman. I say that as a Virginian."[1]

But enough, — enough; and I now turn from this branch of the great subject with a single remark. While exhibiting the Character of Slave-Masters, these numerous instances — and they might be multiplied indefinitely — attest the weakness of their cause. It requires no special talent to estimate the insignificance of an argument that can be supported only by violence. The scholar will not forget the ancient story of the collo-

[1] Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, pp. 203 - 207.

quy between Jupiter and a simple countryman. They talked with ease and freedom until they differed, when the angry god at once menaced his honest opponent with a thunderbolt. "Ah! ah!" said the clown, with perfect composure, "now, Jupiter, I know you are wrong. You are always wrong, when you appeal to your thunder." And permit me to say, that every appeal, whether to the Duel, the revolver, or the bludgeon, every menace of personal violence and every outrage of language, besides disclosing a hideous Barbarism, also discloses the fevered nervousness of a cause already humbled in debate. And then how impotent! Truth, like the sunbeam, cannot be soiled by outward touch, while the best testimony to its might is found in the active passions it provokes. There are occasions when enmity is a panegyric.

(4.) Much as has been said to exhibit the Character of Slave-Masters, the work would be incomplete, if I failed to point out that *unconsciousness* of its fatal influence which completes the evidence of the Barbarism under which they live. Nor am I at liberty to decline this topic; but I shall be brief.

That Senators should seriously declare Slavery "ennobling," at least to the master, and "the black marble keystone of our national arch," would excite wonder, if it were not explained by examples of history. There are men who, in the spirit of paradox, make themselves partisans of a bad cause, as Jerome Cardan wrote an Encomium on Nero. But where there is no disposition to paradox, it is natural that a cherished practice should blind those under its influence; nor is there any end to these exaggerations. According to Thu-

cydides, piracy in the early ages of Greece was alike wide-spread and honorable; and so much was this the case, that Telemachus and Mentor, on landing at Pylos, were asked by Nestor if they were "pirates," [1] — precisely as in South Carolina the stranger might be asked if he were a Slave-Master. Kidnapping, too, a kindred indulgence, was openly avowed, and I doubt not held to be "ennobling." Next to the unconsciousness of childhood is the unconsciousness of Barbarism. The real Barbarian is unconscious as an infant; and the Slave-Master shows much of the same character. No New-Zealander exults in his tattoo, no savage of the Northwest Coast exults in his flat head, more than the Slave-Master of these latter days — always, of course, with honorable exceptions — exults in his unfortunate condition. The Slave-Master hugs his disgusting practice as the Carib of the Gulf hugged Cannibalism, and as Brigham Young now hugs Polygamy. The delusion of the Goitre is repeated. This prodigious swelling of the neck, nothing less than a loathsome wallet of flesh pendulous upon the breast, and sometimes so enormous, that the victim, unable to support the burden, crawls along the ground, is common to the population on the slopes of the Alps; [2] but, accustomed to this deformity, the sufferer comes to regard it with pride, — as Slave-Masters with us, unable to support their burden, and crawling along the ground, regard Slavery, — and it is said that those who have no swelling are laughed at and called "goose-necked." [3]

[1] Thucydides, Hist. Belli Pelop., Lib. I. cap. 5. Odyssey, III. 73.

[2] "Quis tumidum guttur miratur in Alpibus?" — JUVENAL, *Sat. XIII.* 162.

[3] Murray's Handbook for Travellers in Switzerland, 8th ed., Introduction, § 18.

With knowledge comes distrust and the modest consciousness of imperfection; but the pride of Barbarism has no such limitation. It dilates in the thin air of ignorance, and makes boasts. Surely, if the illustrations which I have presented to-day are not entirely inapplicable, then must we find in the boasts of Slave-Masters new occasion to regret that baleful influence under which even love of country is lost in love of Slavery, and the great motto of Franklin is reversed, so as to read, *Ubi Servitudo, ibi Patria.*

It is this same influence which renders Slave-Masters insensible to those characters which are among the true glories of the Republic, — which makes them forget that Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and Washington, who commanded our armies, were Abolitionists, — which renders them indifferent to the inspiring words of the one and the commanding example of the other. Of these great men it is the praise, well deserving perpetual mention, and grudged only by malign influence, that, reared amidst Slavery, they did not hesitate to condemn it. Jefferson, in repeated utterances, alive with the fire of genius and truth, has contributed the most important testimony to Freedom ever pronounced in this hemisphere, in words equal to the cause; and Washington, often quoted as a Slave-Master, in the solemn dispositions of his last will and testament, has contributed an example which is beyond even the words of Jefferson. Do not, Sir, call him Slave-Master, who entered into the presence of his Maker only as Emancipator of his slaves. The difference between such men and the Slave-Masters whom I expose to-day is so precise that it cannot be mistaken. The first *looked down* upon Slavery; the second *look up* to

Slavery. The first, recognizing its wrong, were at once liberated from its insidious influence; while the latter, upholding it as right and "ennobling," must naturally draw from it motives of conduct. The first, conscious of the character of Slavery, were not misled by it; the second, dwelling in unconsciousness of its true character, surrender blindly to its barbarous tendencies, and, verifying the words of the poet, —

> "So perfect is their misery,
> Not once perceive their foul disfigurement,
> But boast themselves more comely than before." [1]

Mr. President, it is time to close this branch of the argument. The Barbarism of Slavery has been exposed, first, in the Law of Slavery, with its five pretensions, founded on the assertion of property in man, the denial of the conjugal relation, the infraction of the parental tie, the exclusion from knowledge, and the robbery of the fruits of another's labor, all these having the single object of *compelling men to work without wages*, while its Barbarism was still further attested by tracing the law in its origin to barbarous Africa; and, secondly, it has been exposed in a careful examination of economical results, illustrated by contrast between the Free States and the Slave States, sustained by official figures. From this exposure I proceeded to consider the influence on Slave-Masters, whose true character stands confessed, — first, in the Law of Slavery, which is their work, — next, in the relations between them and their slaves, maintained by three inhuman instruments, — then, in their intercourse with each other and with society: and here we have seen them at

[1] Milton, Comus, 73 - 75.

home, under the immediate influence of Slavery, also in the communities of which they are a part, practising violence, and pushing it everywhere, in street-fight and duel; especially raging against all who question the pretensions of Slavery, entering even into the Free States, — but not in lawless outbreaks only, also in official acts, as of Georgia and of South Carolina regarding two Massachusetts citizens, — and then, ascending in audacity, entering the Halls of Congress, where they have turned, as at home, against all who oppose their assumptions; while the whole gloomy array of unquestionable facts is closed by the melancholy unconsciousness which constitutes one of the distinctive features of this Barbarism.

Such is my answer to the assumption of fact in behalf of Slavery by Senators on the other side. But before passing to that other assumption of Constitutional Law, which forms the second branch of this discussion, I add testimony to the influence of Slavery on Slave-Masters in other countries, which is too important to be neglected, and may properly find place here.

Among those who have done most to press forward in Russia that sublime act of emancipation by which the present Emperor is winning lustre, not only for his own country, but for our age, is M. Tourgueneff. Originally a Slave-Master himself, with numerous slaves, and residing where Slavery prevailed, he saw, with the instincts of a noble character, the essential Barbarism of this relation, and in an elaborate work on Russia, which is now before me, exposed it with rare ability and courage. Thus he speaks of its influence on Slave-Masters: —

"But if Slavery degrades the slave, it degrades the master more. This is an old adage, and long observation has proved to me that this adage is not a paradox. In fact, how can that man respect his own dignity, his own rights, who has not learned to respect either the rights or the dignity of his fellow-man? What control can the moral and religious sentiments have over a person who sees himself invested with a power so eminently contrary to morality and religion? The continual exercise of an unjust claim, even when moderated, ends in corrupting the character of the man, and perverting his judgment. . . . . The possession of a slave being the result of injustice, the relations of the master with the slave cannot be otherwise than a succession of wrongs. Among good masters (and it is agreed so to call those who do not abuse their power as much as they might) these relations are invested with forms less repugnant than among other masters; but here the difference ends. Who can remain always pure, when, induced by disposition, excited by temper, influenced by caprice, he may with impunity oppress, insult, humiliate his fellow-men? And be it remarked, that enlightenment, civilization, do not avail here. The enlightened man, the civilized man, is nevertheless a man; that he may not oppress, it is necessary that it should be impossible for him to oppress. All men cannot, like Louis the Fourteenth, throw the cane out of the window, when they feel an inclination to strike."[1]

Another authority, unimpeachable at all points, whose fortune it has been, from extensive travels, to see Slavery in the most various forms, and Slave-Masters under the most various conditions, — I refer to the great African traveller, Dr. Livingstone, — thus touches the character of Slave-Masters: —

"I can never cease to be most unfeignedly thankful that I was not born in a land of slaves. No one can under-

[1] La Russie et Les Russes, Tom. II. pp. 157, 158.

stand the effect of the unutterable meanness of the slave system on the minds of those who, *but for the strange obliquity which prevents them from feeling the degradation of not being gentlemen enough to pay for services rendered*, would be equal in virtue to ourselves. Fraud becomes as natural to them as 'paying one's way' is to the rest of mankind."[1]

And so does the experience of Slavery in other countries confirm the sad experience among us.

Second Assumption of Slave-Masters.

Discarding now all presumptuous boasts for Slavery, and bearing in mind its essential Barbarism, I come to consider that second assumption of Senators on the other side, which is, of course, inspired by the first, even if not its immediate consequence, that, under the Constitution, Slave-Masters may take their slaves into the National Territories, and there continue to hold them, as at home in the Slave States, — and that this would be the case in any territory newly acquired, by purchase or by war, as of Mexico on the South or Canada on the North.

Here I begin with the remark, that, as the assumption of Constitutional Law is inspired by the assumption of fact with regard to the "ennobling" character of Slavery, so it must lose much, if not all of its force, when the latter assumption is shown to be false, as has been done to-day.

When Slavery is seen to be the Barbarism which it is, there are few who would not cover it from sight, rather than insist upon sending it abroad with the flag

[1] Missionary Travels, Chap. II. p. 39.

of the Republic. Only because people have been insensible to its true character have they tolerated for a moment its exorbitant pretensions. Therefore this long exposition, where Slavery stands forth in fivefold Barbarism, with the single object of compelling men to work without wages, naturally prepares the way to consider the assumption of Constitutional Law.

This assumption may be described as an attempt to *Africanize* the Constitution, by introducing into it the barbarous Law of Slavery, originally derived, as we have seen, from barbarous Africa, — and then, through such *Africanization* of the Constitution, to *Africanize* the Territories, and *Africanize* the National Government. In using this language to express the obvious effect of this assumption, I borrow a suggestive term, first employed by a Portuguese writer at the beginning of this century, when protesting against the spread of Slavery in Brazil.[1] Analyze the assumption, and it is found to stand on two pretensions, either of which failing, the assumption fails also. These two are, first, the peculiar African pretension of property in man, — and, secondly, the pretension that such property is recognized in the Constitution.

With regard to the first of these pretensions, I might simply refer to what has been said at an earlier stage of this argument. But I should do injustice to the part it plays in this controversy, if I did not again notice it. Then I sought particularly to show its Barbarism ; now I shall show something more.

Property implies an owner and a thing owned. On the one side is a human being, and on the other side a thing. But the very idea of a human being necessarily

[1] Koster, Travels in Brazil, p. 449.

excludes the idea of property in that being, just as the very idea of a thing necessarily excludes the idea of a human being. It is clear that a thing cannot be a human being, and it is equally clear that a human being cannot be a thing. And the law itself, when it adopts the phrase, "relation of master and slave," confesses its reluctance to sanction the claim of property. It shrinks from the pretension of Senators, and satisfies itself with a formula which does not openly degrade human nature.

If this property does exist, out of what title is it derived? Under what ordinance of Nature or of Nature's God is one human being stamped an owner and another stamped a thing? God is no respecter of persons. Where is the sanction for this respect of certain persons to a degree which becomes outrage to other persons? God is the Father of the Human Family, and we all are his children. Where, then, is the sanction of this pretension by which a brother lays violent hands upon a brother? To ask these questions is humiliating; but it is clear there can be but one response. There is no sanction for such pretension, no ordinance for it, no title. On all grounds of reason, and waiving all questions of "positive" statute, the Vermont Judge was nobly right, when, rejecting the claim of a Slave-Master, he said, "No, not until you show a Bill of Sale from the Almighty." Nothing short of this impossible link in the chain of title would do. I know something of the great judgments by which the jurisprudence of our country is illustrated; but I doubt if there is anything in the wisdom of Marshall, the learning of Story, or the completeness of Kent, which will brighten with time like this honest decree.

The intrinsic feebleness of this pretension is apparent in the intrinsic feebleness of the arguments by which it is maintained. These are twofold, and both were put forth in recent debate by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS].

The first is the alleged inferiority of the African race,—an argument instructive to the Slave-Master. The law of life is labor. Slavery is a perpetual effort to evade this law by compelling the labor of others; and such an attempt at evasion is naturally supported by the pretension, that, because the African is inferior, therefore he may be enslaved. But this pretension, while surrendering to Slavery a whole race, leaves it uncertain whether the same principle may not be applied to other races, as to the polished Japanese who are now the guests of the nation,[1] and even to persons of obvious inferiority among the white race. Indeed, the latter pretension is openly set up in other quarters. The "Richmond Enquirer," a leading journal of Slave-Masters, declares, "The principle of Slavery is in itself right, and *does not depend on difference of complexion.*" And a leading writer among Slave-Masters, George Fitzhugh, of Virginia, in his "Sociology for the South," declares, "Slavery, *black or white,* is right and necessary. Nature has made the weak in mind or body for slaves." In the same vein, a Democratic paper of South Carolina has said, "Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the laboring man, *black or white.*"

These more extravagant pretensions reveal still further the feebleness of the pretension put forth by the

[1] A considerable embassy with a numerous suite was received at Washington about this time.

Senator, while instances, accumulating constantly, attest the difficulty of discriminating between the two races. Mr. Paxton, of Virginia, tells us that "the best blood in Virginia flows in the veins of the slaves"; and more than one fugitive has been advertised latterly as possessing "a round face," "blue eyes," "flaxen hair," and as "escaping under the pretence of being a white man."

This is not the time to enter upon the great question of race, in the various lights of religion, history, and science. Sure I am that they who understand it best will be least disposed to the pretension which, on an assumed ground of inferiority, would condemn one race to be the property of another. If the African race be inferior, as is alleged, then unquestionably a Christian Civilization must lift it from degradation, not by the lash and the chain, not by this barbarous pretension of ownership, but by a generous charity, which shall be measured precisely by the extent of inferiority.

The second argument put forward for this pretension, and twice repeated by the Senator from Mississippi, is, that the Africans are the posterity of Ham, the son of Noah, through Canaan, who was cursed by Noah, to be the "servant" — that is the word employed — of his brethren, and that this malediction has fallen upon all his descendants, who are accordingly devoted by God to perpetual bondage, not only in the third and fourth generations, but throughout all succeeding time. Surely, when the Senator quoted Scripture to enforce the claim of Slave-Masters, he did not intend a jest. And yet it is hard to suppose him in earnest. The Senator is Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, where he is doubtless experienced. He may, perhaps,

set a squadron in the field; but, evidently, he has considered very little the text of Scripture on which he relies. The Senator assumes that it has fixed the doom of the colored race, leaving untouched the white race. Perhaps he does not know, that, in the worst days of the Polish aristocracy, this same argument was adopted as excuse for holding white serfs in bondage, precisely as it is now put forward by the Senator, and that even to this day the angry Polish noble addresses his white peasant as "Son of Ham."

It hardly comports with the gravity of this debate to dwell on such an argument; and yet I cannot go wrong, if, for the sake of a much injured race, I brush it away. To justify the Senator in his application of this ancient curse, he must maintain at least five different propositions, as essential links in the chain of the Afric-American slave: *first*, that by this malediction Canaan himself was actually changed into a "chattel," — whereas he is simply made the "servant" of his brethren; *secondly*, that not merely Canaan, but all his posterity, to the remotest generation, was so changed, — whereas the language has no such extent; *thirdly*, that the Afric-American actually belongs to the posterity of Canaan, — an ethnological assumption absurdly difficult to establish; *fourthly*, that each of the descendants of Shem and Japheth has a right to hold an Afric-American fellow-man as a "chattel," — a proposition which finds no semblance of support; and, *fifthly*, that every Slave-Master is truly descended from Shem or Japheth, — a pedigree which no anxiety can establish. This plain analysis, which may fitly excite a smile, shows the fivefold absurdity of an attempt to found this pretension on any

"successive title, long and dark,
Drawn from the mouldy rolls of Noah's ark." [1]

From the character of these two arguments for property in man, I am brought to its denial.

It is natural that Senators who pretend, that, by the Law of Nature, man may hold property in man, should find this pretension in the Constitution. But the pretension is as much without foundation in the Constitution as it is without foundation in Nature. It is not too much to say that there is not one sentence, phrase, or word, not a single suggestion, hint, or equivocation, even, out of which any such pretension can be implied, — while great national acts and important contemporaneous declarations in the Convention which framed the Constitution, in different forms of language, and also controlling rules of interpretation, render this pretension impossible. Partisans, taking counsel of their desires, find in the Constitution, as in the Scriptures, what they incline to find; and never was this more apparent than when Slave-Masters deceive themselves so far as to find in the Constitution a pretension which exists only in their own minds.

Looking for one moment juridically at this question, we are brought to the conclusion, according to the admission of courts and jurists, first in Europe, and then in our own country, that Slavery can be derived from no doubtful word or mere pretension, but only from clear and special recognition. "The state of Slavery," said Lord Mansfield, pronouncing judgment in the great case of Somerset, "is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but

[1] Dryden, Absalom and Achitophel, Part I. 301, 302.

only by *positive law.* It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but POSITIVE LAW," — that is, express words of a written text; and this principle, which commends itself to the enlightened reason, is adopted by several courts in the Slave States. Of course every leaning must be against Slavery. A pretension so peculiar and offensive, so hostile to reason, so repugnant to the Laws of Nature and the inborn Rights of Man, which, in all its fivefold wrong, has no other object than to compel fellow-men to work without wages, — such a pretension, so tyrannical, so unjust, so mean, so barbarous, can find no place in any system of Government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction.* It can spring from no doubtful phrase. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense.

At the adoption of the Constitution, this rule, promulgated in the Court of King's Bench by the voice of the most finished magistrate in English history, was as well known in our country as any principle of the Common Law; especially was it known to the eminent lawyers in the Convention; nor is it too much to say that the Constitution was framed with this rule on Slavery as a guide. And the Supreme Court of the United States, at a later day, by the lips of Chief-Justice Marshall, promulgated this same rule, in words stronger even than those of Lord Mansfield, saying: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the laws is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness,* to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects."[1] It is well known, however, that these two declarations are

[1] United States *v.* Fisher et als., 2 Cranch, 390.

little more than new forms for the ancient rule of the Common Law, as expressed by Fortescue: *Impius et crudelis judicandus est qui Libertati non favet:* "He is to be adjudged impious and cruel who does not favor Liberty,"[1] — and as expressed by Blackstone, "The law is always ready to catch at anything in favor of Liberty."[2]

But, as no prescription runs against the King, so no prescription is allowed to run against Slavery, while all the early victories of Freedom are set aside by the Slave-Masters of to-day. The prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, and all the precedents, legislative and judicial, for the exercise of this power, admitted from the beginning until now, are overturned. At last, bolder grown, Slave-Masters do not hesitate to assail that principle of jurisprudence which makes Slavery the creature of "positive law" alone, to be upheld only by words of "irresistible clearness." The case of Somerset, in which this great rule was declared, is impeached on this floor, as the Declaration of Independence is also impeached. And here the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] takes the lead, with the assertion, that in the history of English law there are earlier cases, where a contrary principle was declared. Permit me to say that no such cases, even if hunted up in authentic reports, can impair the influence of this well-considered authority. The Senator knows well that an old and barbarous case is a poor answer to a principle brought into activity by the demands of advancing Civilization, and which, once recognized, can never be denied. Pardon me, if I remind him that Jurispru-

[1] De Laudibus Legum Angliæ, Cap. XLII.

[2] Commentaries, Vol. II. p. 94.

dence is not a dark-lantern, shining in a narrow circle, and never changing, but a gladsome light, which, slowly emerging from original darkness, grows and spreads with human improvement, until at last it becomes as broad and general as the Light of Day. When the Senator, in this age, leaguing all his forces, undertakes to drag down that immortal principle which made Slavery impossible in England, as, thank God! it makes Slavery impossible under the Constitution, he vainly tugs to drag down a luminary from the sky.

The enormity of the pretension that Slavery is sanctioned by the Constitution becomes still more flagrant, when we read the Constitution in the light of great national acts and of contemporaneous authorities. First comes the Declaration of Independence, the illuminated initial letter of our history, which in familiar words announces "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, *Liberty*, and the Pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Nor does this Declaration, binding the consciences of all who enjoy the privileges it secured, stand alone. There is another national act, less known, but in itself a key to the first, when, at the successful close of the Revolution, the Continental Congress, in a solemn Address to the States, grandly announced: "Let it be remembered that it has ever been the pride and boast of America, *that the rights for which she contended were the Rights of Human Nature.* By the blessing of the Author of *these rights* on the means exerted for their defence, they have prevailed against all opposition, and form THE

BASIS of thirteen independent States."[1] Now, whatever may be the privileges of States in their individual capacities, within their several local jurisdictions, no power can be attributed to the nation, in the absence of positive, unequivocal grant, inconsistent with these two national declarations. Here is the national heart, the national soul, the national will, the national voice, which must inspire our interpretation of the Constitution, and enter into and diffuse itself through all the national legislation. Such are commanding authorities which make "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," and, in more general words, "the Rights of Human Nature," as the basis of our national institutions, without distinction of race, or absurd recognition of the curse of Ham.

In strict harmony with these are the many utterances in the Convention which framed the Constitution: of Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who announced that "*he never would concur in upholding Domestic Slavery;* it was a nefarious institution";[2] of Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, who said that "we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slaves, *but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it*";[3] of Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, who all concurred with Mr. Gerry;[4] and especially of Mr. Madison, of Virginia, who, in a phrase which cannot be quoted too often, "THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROP-

[1] Address to the States, April 26, 1783: Journal of Congress, Vol. VIII. p. 201.

[2] Madison's Debates in the Federal Convention, August 8, 1787.

[3] Ibid., August 22.

[4] Ibid., August 21, 22, 25.

ERTY IN MEN."[1] And, lastly, as if to complete the elaborate work of Freedom, and to embody all these utterances, the word "servitude," which had been allowed in the clause on the apportionment of Representatives, was struck out, and the word "service" substituted. This final and total exclusion from the Constitution of the idea of property in man was on the motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia; and the reason assigned for the substitution, according to Mr. Madison, in his authentic report of the debate, was, that "the former was thought to express the condition of slaves, and the latter *the obligations of free persons.*"[2] Thus, at every point, by great national declarations, by frank utterances in the Convention, and by positive act in adjusting the text of the Constitution, was the idea of property in man unequivocally rejected.

This pretension, which may be dismissed as utterly baseless, becomes absurd, when it is considered to what result it necessarily conducts. If the Barbarism of Slavery, in all its fivefold wrong, is really embodied in the Constitution, so as to be beyond reach of prohibition, either Congressional or local, in the Territories, then, for the same reason, it must be beyond reach of prohibition, even by local authority, in the States themselves, and, just so long as the Constitution continues unchanged, Territories and States alike must be exposed to all its blasting influences. Do we not witness this result in open attempts now made by Slave-Masters to travel with their slaves in the Free States? Calling the slave-roll in the shadow of Bunker Hill, according to well-known menace, will be the triumph of this

[1] Madison's Debates in the Federal Convention, August 25, 1787.
[2] Ibid., September 13.

consummation. And yet this pretension, which in natural consequences overturns State Rights, is announced by Senators who profess to be special guardians of State Rights.

Nor does this pretension derive any support from the much debated clause in the Constitution for the rendition of fugitives from "service or labor," on which so much stress is constantly put. I do not occupy your time now on this head for two reasons: first, because, having on a former occasion exhibited with great fulness the character of that clause, I am unwilling now thus incidentally to open the question upon it; and, secondly, because, whatever may be its character, — admitting that it confers power upon Congress, — and admitting, also, what is often denied, that, in defiance of commanding rules of interpretation, the equivocal words there employed have that "irresistible clearness" which is necessary in taking away Human Rights, — yet nothing can be clearer than that the fugitives, whosoever they be, are regarded under the Constitution as *persons*, and not as *property*.

I disdain to dwell on that other argument, brought forward by Senators, who, denying the Equality of Men, speciously assert the Equality of the States, and from this principle, true in many respects, jump to the conclusion, that Slave-Masters are entitled, in the name of Equality, to take slaves into the National Territories, under solemn safeguard of the Constitution. This argument comes back to the first pretension, that slaves are recognized as "property" in the Constitution. To that pretension, already amply exposed, we are always brought, nor can any sounding allegation of State Equality avoid it. And yet this very argument be-

trays the inconsistency of its authors. If persons held to service in the Slave States are "property" under the Constitution, then under the provision known as "the three-fifths rule," which founds representation in the other House on such persons, there is a *property representation* from the Slave States, with voice and vote, while there is no such *property representation* from the Free States. With glaring inequality, the representation of Slave States is founded, first, on "persons," and, secondly, on a large part of their pretended property, while the representation of the Free States is founded simply on "persons," leaving all their boundless millions of property unrepresented. Thus, whichever way we approach it, the absurdity of this pretension becomes manifest. Assuming the pretension of property in man under the Constitution, you upset the whole theory of State Equality, for you disclose a gigantic inequality between the Slave States and the Free States; and assuming the Equality of States, in the House of Representatives as elsewhere, you upset the whole pretension of property in man under the Constitution.

Nor will I deign to dwell on one other argument, which, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, undertakes to secure for the people in the Territories the wicked power — sometimes, by confusion of terms, called "right" — to enslave their fellow-men: as if this pretension was not crushed at once by the Declaration of Independence, when it announced that all governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and as if anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, which contains no sentence, phrase, or word sanctioning this outrage, and which carefully excludes the idea of property in man, while it surrounds all persons with

the highest safeguards of a citizen, such pretension could exist. Whatever it may be elsewhere, Popular Sovereignty within the sphere of the Constitution has its limitations. Claiming for all the largest liberty of a true Civilization, it compresses all within the constraints of Justice; nor does it allow any man to assert a right to do what he pleases, except when he pleases to do right. As well within the Territories attempt to make a king as attempt to make a slave. Beyond all doubt, no majority can be permitted to pass on the question, whether fellow-men shall be bought and sold like cattle. There are rights which cannot be "voted up" or "voted down," according to phrases of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for they are above all votes. The very act of voting upon the question of reducing men to bondage is a heinous wrong, for it assumes that we may do unto others what we would not have them do unto us. But this pretension, — rejected alike by every Slave-Master and by every lover of Freedom, —

> "Where I behold a factious band agree
> To call it Freedom, when themselves are free," [1] —

proceeding originally from vain effort to avoid the impending question between Freedom and Slavery, — assuming a delusive phrase of Freedom as a cloak for Slavery, — speaking with the voice of Jacob, while its hands are the hands of Esau, — and, by plausible nickname, enabling politicians sometimes to deceive the public, and sometimes even to deceive themselves, — may be dismissed with other kindred pretensions for Slavery; while the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who, if not inventor, has been its boldest defender, will learn that Slave-Masters, for whom he has done so

[1] Goldsmith, The Traveller, 383, 384.

much, cannot afford to be generous, — that their gratitude is founded on what they expect, and not on what they receive, — and that, having its root in desire rather than in fruition, it necessarily withers and dies with the power to serve them. The Senator, revolving these things, may confess the difficulty of his position, and perhaps

> "remember Milo's end,
> Wedged in that timber which he strove to rend." [1]

The pretension that in the Territories Slavery may be "voted up" or "voted down," as the few people there see fit, is a novelty, and its partisans, besides a general oblivion of great principles, most strangely forget the power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," limited only by temporary exception in favor of "the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit" until 1808. These express words, solemnly accepted as part of the Constitution, attest the power of Congress to prevent "the migration" of slaves into the Territories. The migration or importation of slaves into any State existing at the adoption of the Constitution was tolerated until 1808; but from that date the power of Congress became plenary to prohibit their "importation" from abroad or "migration" among existing States, while from the beginning this power was plenary to prevent their "migration" into the Territories. And as early as 1804 Congress exercised this power, by providing that no slave should be introduced into the Territory of Orleans, except by a citizen of the United States removing thither for actual settlement, and at

[1] Roscommon. Essay on Translated Verse, 87, 88.

the time *bonâ fide* owner of such slave; and every slave imported or brought into the Territory, contrary to this provision, is declared free.[1] In this unquestioned exercise of a beneficent power, at a time when the authors of the Constitution were still on the stage, and the temporary exception in favor of existing States was in force, we have a precedent of unanswerable authority, establishing the power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories, even if it be assumed, that, under the Constitution, this five-headed Barbarism can find place anywhere within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Nation.

Here I close this branch of the argument, which I have treated less fully than the first, partly because time and strength fail me, but chiefly because the Barbarism of Slavery, when fully established, supersedes all other inquiry. Enough is done on this head. At the risk of repetition, I gather it together. The assumption, that Slave-Masters, under the Constitution, may take their slaves into Territories and continue to hold them as in States, stands on two pretensions, — first, that man may hold property in man, and, secondly, that this property is recognized in the Constitution. But we have seen that the pretended property in man stands on no reason, while the two special arguments by which it is asserted — first, an alleged inferiority of race, and, secondly, the ancient curse of Ham — are grossly insufficient to uphold such pretension. And we have next seen that this pretension has as little support in the Constitution as in reason;

[1] Acts of 8th Cong. 1st Sess., Ch. 38, sec. 10, March 26, 1804: United States Statutes at Large, Vol. II. p. 286.

that Slavery is of such an offensive character, that it can find support only in "positive" sanction, and words of "irresistible clearness"; that this benign rule, questioned in the Senate, is consistent with the principles of an advanced Civilization; that no such "positive" sanction, in words of "irresistible clearness," can be found in the Constitution, while, in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, and the Address of the Continental Congress, the contemporaneous declarations in the Convention, and especially the act of the Convention substituting "service" for "servitude," on the ground that the latter expressed "the condition of slaves," all attest that the pretension that man can hold property in man was carefully, scrupulously, and completely excluded from the Constitution, so that it has no semblance of support in that sacred text; nor is this pretension, which is unsupported in the Constitution, helped by the two arguments, one in the name of State Equality, and the other in the name of Popular Sovereignty, both of which are properly put aside.

Sir, the true principle, which, reversing all assumptions of Slave-Masters, makes Freedom *national* and Slavery *sectional*, while every just claim of the Slave States is harmonized with the irresistible predominance of Freedom under the Constitution, was declared at Chicago.[1] Not questioning the right of each State, whether South Carolina or Turkey, Virginia or Russia, to order and control its domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, the Convention there assembled has explicitly announced Freedom to

[1] By the Republican Convention, which nominated Abraham Lincoln and adopted a platform of principles.

be "the normal condition of all the territory of the United States," and has explicitly denied "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States." Such is the triumphant response by the aroused millions of the North to the assumption of Slave-Masters, that the Constitution, of its own force, carries Slavery into the Territories, and also to the device of politicians, that the people of the Territories, in the exercise of a dishonest Popular Sovereignty, may plant Slavery there. This response is complete at all points, whether the Constitution acts upon the Territories before their organization, or only afterward; for, in the absence of a Territorial Government, there can be no "positive" law in words of "irresistible clearness" for Slavery, as there can be no such law, when a Territorial Government is organized, under the Constitution. Thus the normal condition of the Territories is confirmed by the Constitution, which, when extended over them, renders Slavery impossible, while it writes upon the soil and engraves upon the rock everywhere the law of impartial Freedom, without distinction of color or race.

Mr. President, this argument is now closed. Pardon me for the time I have occupied. It is long since I made any such claim upon your attention. Pardon me, also, if I have said anything I ought not to have said. I have spoken frankly and from the heart,— if severely, yet only with the severity of a sorrowful candor, calling things by their right names, and letting historic facts tell their unimpeachable story. I have spoken in patriotic hope of contributing to the wel-

fare of my country, and also in assured conviction that this utterance to-day will find response in generous souls. I believe that I have said nothing which is not sustained by well-founded argument or well-founded testimony, nothing which can be controverted without direct assault upon reason or upon truth.

The two assumptions of Slave-Masters are answered. But this is not enough. Let the answer become a legislative act, by the admission of Kansas as a Free State. Then will the Barbarism of Slavery be repelled, and the pretension of property in man be rebuked. Such an act, closing this long struggle by assurance of peace to the Territory, if not of tranquillity to the whole country, will be more grateful still as herald of that better day, near at hand, when Freedom will find a home everywhere under the National Government, when the National Flag, wherever it floats, on sea or land, within the national jurisdiction, will cover none but freemen, and the Declaration of Independence, now reviled in the name of Slavery, will be reverenced as the American Magna Charta of Human Rights. Nor is this all. Such an act will be the first stage in those triumphs by which the Republic, lifted in character so as to become an example to mankind, will enter at last upon its noble "prerogative of teaching the nations how to live."

Thus, Sir, speaking for Freedom in Kansas, I have spoken for Freedom everywhere, and for Civilization; and as the less is contained in the greater, so are all arts, all sciences, all economies, all refinements, all charities, all delights of life, embodied in this cause. You may reject it, but it will be only for to-day. The sacred animosity of Freedom and Slavery can end only with the triumph of Freedom. The same question will

be carried soon before that high tribunal, supreme over Senate and Court, where the judges are counted by millions, and the judgment rendered will be the solemn charge of an awakened people, instructing a new President, in the name of Freedom, to see that Civilization receives no detriment.

When Mr. Sumner resumed his seat, Mr. Chesnut, of South Carolina, spoke as follows.

"Mr. President, after the extraordinary, though characteristic, speech just uttered in the Senate, it is proper that I assign the reason for the position we are now inclined to assume. After ranging over Europe, crawling through the back doors to whine at the feet of British aristocracy, craving pity, and reaping a rich harvest of contempt, the slanderer of States and men reappears in the Senate. We had hoped to be relieved from the outpourings of such vulgar malice. We had hoped that one who had felt, though ignominiously he failed to meet, the consequences of a former insolence would have become wiser, if not better, by experience. In this I am disappointed, and I regret it. Mr. President, in the heroic ages of the world men were deified for the possession and the exercise of some virtues, — wisdom, truth, justice, magnanimity, courage. In Egypt, also, we know they deified beasts and reptiles; but even that bestial people worshipped their idols on account of some supposed virtue. It has been left for this day, for this country, for the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, *to deify the incarnation of malice, mendacity, and cowardice.* Sir, we do not intend to be guilty of aiding in the apotheosis of pusillanimity and meanness. We do not intend to contribute, by any conduct on our part, to increase the devotees at the shrine of this new idol. We know what is expected and what is desired. *We are not inclined again to send forth the recipient of* PUNISHMENT *howling through the world, yelping fresh cries of slander and malice. These are the reasons*, which I feel it due to myself and others to give to the Senate and the country, why we have quietly listened to what has been said, and why we can take no other notice of the matter."

In these words Mr. Chesnut refers to the assault upon Mr. Sumner, with a bludgeon, on the floor of the Senate, by a Representative from South Carolina, since dead, aided by another Representative from that same State, and also a Representative from Virginia, on account of which Mr. Sumner had been compelled to leave his seat vacant, and seek the restoration of his health by travel. As Mr. Chesnut spoke, he was surrounded by the Slave-Masters of the Senate, who seemed to approve

what he said. There was no call to order by the Chair, which was occupied at the time by Mr. Bigler, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Sumner obtained the floor with difficulty, while a motion was pending for the postponement of the question, and said: —

Mr. President, before this question passes away, I think I ought to make answer to the Senator from South Carolina, — though perhaps there is no occasion for it. [*"No!" from several Senators.*] Only one word. I exposed to-day the *Barbarism of Slavery.* What the Senator has said in reply I may well print as an additional illustration. That is all.

Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, said: —

"I hope he will do it."

The first pamphlet edition of this speech contained a note which is preserved here.

"The following letter, from a venerable citizen, an ornament of our legislative halls at the beginning of the century, and now the oldest survivor of all who have ever been members of Congress, is too valuable in testimony and counsel to be omitted in this place.

"'BOSTON, June 5, 1860.

"'DEAR SIR, — I have read a few abstracts from your noble speech, but must wait for it in a pamphlet form, that I may read it in such type as eyes in the eighty-ninth year of their age will permit. But I have read enough to approve, and rejoice that you have been permitted thus truly, fully, and faithfully to expose the 'Barbarism' of Slavery on that very floor on which you were so cruelly and brutally stricken down by the spirit of that Barbarism.

"'I only hope that in an Appendix you will preserve the *vera effigies* of that insect that attempted to sting you. Remember that the value of amber is increased by the insect it preserves.

"'Yours, very truly,

"'JOSIAH QUINCY.'"

APPENDIX.

THE speech on the Barbarism of Slavery was followed by outbursts of opinion which exhibit the state of the public mind at the time. There was approval and opposition, and there was also menace of violence. As this was promptly encountered, it could never be known to what extent the plot had proceeded.

Mr. Sumner was at his lodgings, alone, on the fourth day after the speech, when, about six o'clock, P. M., he received a visit from a stranger, who opened conversation by saying that he was one of the class recently slandered, being a Southern man and a slaveholder, and that he had called for an explanation of the speech, and to hold its author responsible. A few words ensued, in which the visitor became still more offensive, when Mr. Sumner ordered him out of the room. After some delay, he left, saying, in violent tone, that he was one of four who had come from Virginia for the express purpose of holding Mr. Sumner responsible, and that he would call upon him again with his friends. Mr. Sumner sent at once to his colleague, Mr. Wilson, who quickly joined him. While they were together, a person came to the door who asked particularly to see Mr. Sumner alone, and when told that he was not alone, declined to enter. About nine o'clock in the evening three other persons came to the door, who asked to see Mr. Sumner alone, and receiving the same answer, they sent word by the domestic who opened the door, that Mr. ——— and two friends had called, but, not finding him alone, they would call again in the morning, for a private interview, and if they could not have it, they would cut his d——d throat before the next night. Such a message, with the attendant circumstances, put the friends of Mr. Sumner on their guard, and it was determined, contrary to his desire, that one or more should sleep in the house that night. Accordingly Hon. Anson Burlingame and Hon. John Sherman, both Representatives, slept in the room opening into his bedroom. In the morning other circumstances increased the suspicion that personal injury was intended.

It was the desire of Mr. Sumner that this incident should be kept out of the newspapers; but it became known, and caused no small ex-

citement at Washington, and through the country. It was the subject of telegrams and of letters. The anxiety in Boston was shown in a letter, under date of June 9, from his friend Hon. Edward L. Pierce, saying: —

"We have just heard of the threat of violence made to you last evening. Dr. Howe and others meditate leaving for Washington forthwith. I wish I could be there; but I feel assured that there are enough to protect you, if you will only let them. Do be careful, very careful. You will not be safe, until you have arrived in the Free States on your way home."

Messrs. Thayer and Eldridge, booksellers, wrote at once from Boston: —

"If you need assistance in defending yourself against the ruffians of the Slave Power, please telegraph us *at once*, or to some of your friends here who will notify us. There is a strong feeling here, and we can raise a small body of men, who will join with your Washington friends, or will alone defend you."

Hon. Gershom B. Weston, a veteran, wrote from Duxbury, Massachusetts: —

"I am ready to shoulder my musket and march to the Capitol, and there sacrifice my life in defence of Free Speech and the Right."

Hon. M. F. Conway, then in Washington, and afterwards Representative in Congress from Kansas, sent in to Mr. Sumner, while in his seat, this warning and tender of service: —

"You are not safe to be alone at any time. I will be glad to be with you all the time, if practicable. I ask the privilege especially of being one of your companions at night. I will accompany you from the Senate Chamber, when you leave this evening."

In reply to an inquiry from home, Hon. James Buffinton, of the House of Representatives, wrote: —

"The Massachusetts delegation in Congress will stand by Mr. Sumner and his late speech. There will be no backing down by us, and I am in hopes our people at home will pursue the same course."

The Mayor of Washington invited Mr. Sumner to make affidavit of the facts, or to lodge a complaint, which the latter declined to do, saying that he and his friends had no inducement from the past to rely upon Washington magistrates. At last the Mayor brought the original offender, being a well-known Washington office-holder of Virginia, to Mr. Sumner's room, when he apologized for his conduct, and denied all knowledge of the visitors later in the evening who left the brutal message.

The friends of Mr. Sumner did not feel entirely relieved. Among these was his private secretary, A. B. Johnson, Esq., afterwards chief clerk of the Lighthouse Board, who, untiring in friendship and fidelity, without consulting him, arranged protection for the night, and a body-guard between his lodgings and the Senate. The latter service was generously assumed by citizens of Kansas, who, under the captaincy of Augustus Wattles, insisted upon testifying in this way their sense of his efforts for them. Apprised of Mr. Sumner's habit of walking to and from the Capitol, they watched his door, and, as he came out, put themselves at covering distance behind, with revolvers in hand, and then, unknown to him, followed to the door of the Senate. In the same way they followed him home. This body-guard, especially in connection with the previous menace, illustrates the era of Slavery.

The personal incident just described was lost in the larger discussion caused by the speech itself, in the press and in correspondence.

THE PRESS.

THE appearance of the Senate at the delivery of the speech was described by the correspondent of the *New York Herald* in his letter of the same date.

"During the delivery of this exasperating bill of charges, specifications, and denunciation of that 'sum of all villanies,' Slavery, a profound and most ominous silence prevailed on the floor of the Senate and in the galleries. We have no recollection in our experience here, running through a period of twenty years, of anything like this ominous silence during the delivery of a speech for Buncombe, on Slavery, by a Northern fanatic or a Southern fire-eater. We say ominous silence, because we can only recognize it as something fearfully ominous, — ominous of mischief, — ominous of the revival in this capital and throughout the country of the Slavery agitation, with a tenfold bitterness compared with any previous stirring up of the fountains of bitter waters."

The correspondent of the *New York Tribune* of the same date wrote: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech attracted a large audience to the Senate galleries, which continued well filled during the four hours of his scourging review of Slavery in all its relations, political, social, moral, and economical. There appeared to be a studied effort at indifference on the Democratic side; for only a dozen Senators were in their seats during the first hour or two. Afterward they gradually appeared, and leading Southern members from

the House contributed to the general interest by their presence and attention.

"As a whole, this speech was regarded as being more offensive by the South than the one which created such a sensation before, and there is reason to believe, that, but for prudential considerations, it might have been attended with similar results. It was found quite difficult to restrain some decided exhibition of resentment in certain quarters. The only expression of indignation which found vent was in Mr. Chesnut's brief and angry reply, from which the general temper of the South may be inferred, as he is regarded among the most discreet and considerate in his tone and bearing."

The correspondent of the *Chicago Press and Tribune*, under date of June 5, wrote: —

"The speech of Charles Sumner yesterday was probably the most masterly and exhaustive argument against human bondage that has ever been made in this or any other country, since man first commenced to oppress his fellow-man. He took the floor at ten minutes past twelve, and spoke until a little after four. The tone of the speech was not vindictive, and yet there was a terrible severity running through it that literally awed the Southern side. There will, of course, be various opinions as to the *policy* of this awful arraignment of the Slave Power, yet there can be but one opinion as to its extraordinary logical completeness, and, however it may affect public opinion to-day, it is an effort that will live in history long after the ephemeral contest of this age shall have passed away. Indeed, while listening to it, I could not but feel — and the same feeling was, I know, experienced by others — that the eloquent and brave orator was speaking rather to future generations, and to the impartial audience of the whole civilized world, than to the men of to-day, with a view of effecting any result upon elements with which he was immediately surrounded."

The correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* wrote, under date of June 5: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech was a tremendous attack upon Slavery, and was utterly devoid of personalities. He attacked *the institution*, and not individuals, but his language was very severe. There was no let-up in the severity from beginning to end. Facts were quoted, and *they* were allowed to bear against States as well as individuals; but Mr. Sumner made no comment upon that class of facts. While he was exhibiting the barbarous character of Slave-Masters, there was a good deal of restlessness on the slaveholding side of the Senate Hall, as if it required great self-control to keep silence."

The correspondent of the *Boston Traveller* wrote, at length on the delivery, and the impression produced. Here is an extract: —

"So far as personal violence was to be apprehended, we think he was as unconcerned as a man could be. Anxiety on that account might have been

felt by his friends, but not by him. He seemed to be all forgetful of himself, and to have his mind dwelling on the cause to which he was devoted, the race for which he was to plead, and on the responsibility under which he stood to his country and to generations to come. . . . .

"There was something sublime in the ardor and boldness and majesty with which he spoke. At times we could not but forget the speech, and think only of the speaker, — the honorable emulation of his youth, the illustrious services of his manhood, the purity of his aims, the sufferings he had endured, and the merciful Providence which had preserved him. Nothing could surpass the effect of the concluding paragraphs, in which he predicted a Republican triumph in November next.

"The four hours during which we listened to him can never pass from our memory. It would be superfluous here even to enumerate the points of the speech, or to suggest its most powerful passages, for it will be universally read. An arraignment of Slavery so exhaustive has never before been made in our history, and it will supersede the necessity of another. Hereafter, when one desires to prove Slavery irrational and unconstitutional, he will go to that speech as to an arsenal. During a part of its delivery, the Southern Senators, as Toombs and Wigfall, were very uneasy, walking about the Senate, and conversing aloud. Keitt and other members of the House from South Carolina were also in the Senate Chamber, and were rather unquiet. Near Mr. Sumner, throughout his speech, sat his colleague, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Burlingame, and Owen Lovejoy; and had any Southern member attempted a repetition of the Brooks assault, he would have found in either of them a foeman worthy of his steel.

"The Republican Senators gave excellent attention to the speech. Some of them; who are understood to hold very moderate and conservative opinions, expressed a strong admiration of the speech. One of them called it 'a mighty effort'; another said it was 'the greatest speech of the age'; another said 'it was an unanswerable refutation of the doctrines which Senators from Slave States had repeatedly advanced and debated in favor of the justice and policy of Slavery, and it was a good work.' . . . .

"Mr. Sumner was called upon last evening by some of the leading citizens of Kansas, some of whom are to hold official positions upon its admission, who thanked him for his speech, and assured him that their cause would rather be advanced than injured by it. Their course puts to shame the timidity of some persons who were opposed to its delivery, fearing lest it would defeat the admission of Kansas, — just as if the Proslavery Democracy, in their treatment of that question, are to be governed by any consideration except their own party interests and the demands of Slavery. It is time that the Republican party pursued its own course, without asking the counsel or permission of its adversaries."

An occasional correspondent of the *Chatauque Democrat*, New York, gave a familiar sketch of the scene.

"Mr. Breckinridge remained all the time, and sat with an open book in

his hands, pretending to read; but his eyes wandered from the page, and, with a frown upon his brow, he finally gazed at the speaker till he closed. Jeff Davis pretended to be reading the *Globe*, but it was plain to be seen by the heading of the paper that it was upside down. Wigfall seemed in torment. He listened respectfully awhile, and then glided silently around from one Senator to another, and conferred in whispers. He seemed to be hatching mischief; but the grave shake of the head of the older Senators doubtless kept this uneasy, restless desperado quiet. Hunter sat like a rock, immovable, and listened respectfully to the whole. Not a muscle moved upon his placid face to denote what was going on in his mind. Toombs heard the most of it quietly, and with as much of a don't-care look as his evil passions would permit. Near the close, 'Sheep's-Gray' Mason came in and took his seat, and commenced writing a letter. He evidently intended to show the galleries that Sumner was too small for him to notice. But he soon found a seat in a distant part of the Hall, and an easy position, where he sat gloomily scowling upon the orator till he sat down. When the speech was about half through, Keitt, the accomplice of Brooks in his attempted assassination of Mr. Sumner, came in and took a seat near Senator Hammond. For a while he sat gazing about the galleries, evidently to notice the dramatic effect of his presence upon the audience there. But few seemed to notice him. By degrees he began to pay attention to the speech. . . . . Curry, of Alabama, and Lamar, of Mississippi, members of the other House, though Southerners of the straitest sect, could not conceal their delight at the oratory and classic and scholarly feast before them. They are scholars and orators themselves, and could appreciate an intellectual treat, though the sentiments were ever so obnoxious.

"On the Republican side breathless attention prevailed. Those who immediately surrounded the Senator were Mr. Wilson, Senator Bingham, John Hickman, Preston King, and Solomon Foot. Mr. Seward sat in his usual seat, and scarcely moved during the delivery of the great speech."

As the speech was read, the conflict of opinion began to show itself. Democrats were all against it; Republicans were divided.

The *New York Tribune*, in an editorial notice, said:—

"We have said that Mr. Sumner's was doubtless a strong and forcible speech: and yet we wish he had made it on some other bill than that providing for the admission of Kansas."

A Boston paper, in a letter from Washington, contained the following reply to the *New York Tribune*.

"And speaking of Kansas, I may here say that a number of leading Kansas men have called on Mr. Sumner to assure him that the *Tribune's* idea, that his speech injured the prospect of the admission of their State, never found lodgement in their minds. They thank him for it, and assure him, that, of their own knowledge, the fate of the bill was decided before he took the floor."

The *New York Evening Post*, after observing that the speech was "elaborate, learned, eloquent, and exhaustive of every topic on which it touched," said: —

"Though nominally relating to the bill for the admission of Kansas, his remarks took a wider range, and were a general arraignment of the system of Slavery, as it exists in the Southern States of this Union, in all its moral, political, and social aspects. . . . .

"No one, we presume, can fail to admire the ability and cogency of this address; but whether the peculiar line of argument was called for at this time, or whether it will aid in the passage of the Kansas Admission Bill, may admit of doubt."

The *New York Times* was as little sympathetic as the *Tribune*.

"From beginning to end it was a vehement denunciation of Slavery. The labor of four leisure years seems to have been devoted by Mr. Sumner to collecting every instance of cruelty, violence, passion, coarseness, and vulgarity recorded as having happened within the Slave States, or as having been committed by a slaveholder. . . . . But, aside from its utter irrelevancy to the Kansas Question, what general good can be hoped for from such envenomed attacks upon the Slave States? Do they tend in any way to promote the public welfare? Do they aid in the least the solution of what every sensible man acknowledges to be the most delicate and difficult problem of this age?"

Then, in another number, the *Times* said: —

"Fortunately, it has commanded less attention than was anticipated, and has encountered silence in some quarters, and positive disapproval in others, usually disposed to judge speeches of this class with the utmost forbearance. Even the *Tribune*, while it has published the speech in its editions intended mainly for the country, has not deemed it judicious or wise to give it circulation among its city readers; and some of the most decided Republican papers in the country have protested against the injustice of holding the party responsible for its sentiments."

The *New York Herald* took advantage of the speech to hold up the consequences of "Black Republicanism." On the day after the delivery, it wrote thus: —

"*Important from Washington. — The Great Republican Manifesto. — Opening of the Campaign in Earnest. — Charles Sumner's Inflammatory Harangue in the Senate. — Appeal to the North against the South. — The Fivefold Wrong of Human Slavery. — Its Total Abolition in the United States the Sacred Duty of the Republican Party. — The Helper and Spooner Programmes fully and emphatically indorsed. — Mr. Sumner the Leading Light of the Black Republicans.*

"We give elsewhere, to-day, in full, the speech of Senator Sumner, of

Massachusetts, on the great question that is presented to the whole country for judgment in November next.

"Not only the argument it contains, but the place where it was uttered, and the position and character of the man who uttered it, should be taken into consideration, in measuring its bearing upon, and relation to, what may truthfully be called the greatest question of the present age. . . . .

"In that Senate which has so often resounded with the sublimest utterances of human lips and human hopes, Mr. Sumner stands forth the personification of a great and a free State, and the representative man of a great and powerful political party in fifteen of the sovereign States of this Union. He possesses the philosophical acumen of Mr. Seward, without his cautious reserve as a politician, — the honesty of Lincoln, without the craft of a candidate in nomination, — and literary culture, political zeal, and the gift of eloquence, which place him in the very foremost rank as a leader and an exponent of the Black Republican ideas. All of these circumstances combine to give a more deep solemnity to his words, in this grave moment of their utterance. . . . .

"Every man admits that our fraternal relations with the Southern States are productive of unmixed benefit to us and to ours; and yet Lincoln and Seward incite the North to an 'irrepressible conflict' with the South; and now comes another mighty leader among the Black Republicans, and proclaims it to be a 'sacred animosity.'

"This is the burden of Mr. Sumner's eloquence, and we need not enter upon its details. But there is one characteristic of this speech which is in perfect accordance with the policy of the Black Republican party in the present campaign. The bloody and terrible results which must ensue, if that party succeeds in getting possession of the Federal Government, are kept carefully out of view. John Brown's practice is taught, but there is no word of John Brown. The social condition of fifteen populous, rich, and powerful States is to be revolutionized; but not a hint of the possibility of resistance on their part, or of the reactive effect of such resistance upon the aggressive North, is dropped."

On the next day the *Herald* said : —

"*Sumner's Truthful Exposition of the Aims of Black Republicanism. — Its Teachings in the coming Conventions.*

"The perfect platform of the Black Republican party has been laid down by Senator Sumner in his recent speech in the Senate, and it is now before the country for approval or rejection."

In the same spirit, the *Richmond Despatch* recognized the speech as an authentic manifestation of Northern sentiment.

"The fact is, Sumner has spoken but too truly. His is the spirit in which the South is regarded by the party to which he belongs. He is its mouthpiece. His is the tongue to the Abolition lyre, giving it utterance, bringing out its genuine tones. Greeley and Raymond are afraid, just at this mo-

ment, to speak the whole truth. They dare not let the conservative portion of the people at the North know that it is the design of the party with which they are associated to make uncompromising war upon the South, — to destroy its institutions at any cost of blood, to hunt down its people even to the extremity of death, if it be necessary. The South ought to feel obliged to Sumner for betraying the designs of the party. His speech is a god-send."

The *Indianapolis Daily Journal* wrote : —

"We have read as much of Senator Sumner's speech on the Barbarism of Slavery as we have had time to read, and must bear witness that it is one of the ablest, most exasperating, and most useless speeches we ever read. It shows all through the genius, the learning, and the hate of its gifted and abused author. It is manifestly the revenge of the orator on the institution that through Brooks's arm struck him down so brutally. It is intended less to check the growth of Slavery than to gall Slaveholders. It is a scalding, excoriating invective, almost without parallel in the annals of oratory. .... As a vengeance for the orator's own wrongs, it is ample and admirable. As an implement to aid the great work of repressing Slavery extension, it is simply worthless, or worse. Slavery is all that he charges. But slaveholders are not as barbarous as their system."

The *Boston Daily Advertiser* begins by saying of the speech, that "its denunciation, although strong, is not hot; its profuse learning and reference to history show elaboration and study; and the whole mass of reasoning, of rhetoric, and of authority is brought together and wielded with such skill and power as the greatest masters of oratory might well envy"; and then the journal proceeds : —

"We confess that in our judgment the argument upon Slavery itself need be neither long nor elaborate. The Golden Rule has exhausted the subject, both upon principle and authority. The testimony of one enlightened slaveholder like Jefferson, who 'trembled for his country, when he remembered that God was just,' tells us as much of the actual workings of the institution as all the hideous narratives which its opponents have culled in such appalling profusion from its current history. The subject is one which is governed by principles which are essentially and peculiarly elementary, and we confess that we see not how any powers of eloquence or reasoning could turn him who is not convinced by the simple statement of these few original principles. . . . .

"If the majority of the people are already right upon the main subject, — and we should otherwise despair of the Republic, — we must conclude that our efforts will be much more efficacious, if directed at those constitutional heresies by means of which this giant evil is at present carrying on its attack. It is in this way, chiefly, that, within those limits of duty which the Republican party is ever careful to affirm and observe, we can hope to act efficiently upon this great question."

The tone of the Democratic papers appears in the *Albany Atlas and Argus.*

"No one can rise from a perusal of this speech without a contempt for the author, and a conviction of his unfitness for the place."

Also in the *Boston Post.*

"Charles Sumner's recent speech is a curiosity that has no parallel, at least in our Senatorial record. Pedantry, egotism, fortuitous hypothesis, malice, rhapsody, and verbosity stripe and emblazon it with disgusting conspicuousness."

Other papers were grateful and enthusiastic, generally in proportion to their Antislavery character.

The *Boston Traveller* said : —

"No nobler specimen of American eloquence can be found than this logical, bold, spirited, clear, and learned exposition of the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' In it we have the views of the chivalrous antagonist of Wrong, expressed in the pointed and elegant language of the accomplished scholar, and guided by the intellect of the sagacious and benevolent statesman. We are the more pleased with the plain speaking of Mr. Sumner, because there has apparently been a falling off in the language of some leading Republicans since the beginning of the Presidential contest, as if they were fearful of offending the Oligarchy. Mr. Sumner, who has no idea of sacrificing the Right to the Expedient, has given utterance to vital truths in language full of vital energy, — 'Thoughts that breathe, and words that burn.'"

The *Boston Transcript* said : —

"Many persons, who read this speech without having previously read a number of speeches made on the other side, may be likely to consider it too abstract in its character. But, as many Southern Senators, who assume to be the representative men of their section, have gravely lectured the Senate at great length in defence of the principles and practice of Slavery, have taken the bold ground that it is in accordance with the commands of God and the teachings of experience, have attempted to show that it elevates the white man and blesses the black, have even gone so far as to assert that labor, whether white or black, is happier when owned than when hired, and on the strength of these assumptions have eagerly argued for the extension of such a beneficent institution into territory now free, it is certainly proper that some man from the Northern States should make an attempt to save religion, conscience, reason, common sense, common sensibility, from being pressed into the service of the wickedest and most nonsensical paradoxes that ever entered the brain or came out of the mouth of educated men."

The *Boston Atlas and Bee* said : —

"It is not too much to say that it is the boldest, most thorough, and most uncompromising speech that Mr. Sumner has ever delivered; and it is easy to see that it must prove the most offensive to the slaveholders of any of his speeches. It is a complete hand-book of their offences, and will excite in them great and perhaps irrepressible rage. . . . .

"In vigor of thought and style, this speech will rank among the greatest, if not at the head, of Mr. Sumner's productions. It is straightforward, direct, logical, proceeding directly to its mark and by the shortest line, striking the swiftest and hardest blows, and never for a moment leaving the reader in doubt as to its meaning, while it is enlivened by even more than the orator's usual wealth of classical and historical lore. It is in every respect a remarkable speech, and will arrest the attention of the whole country."

The *Boston Journal* said : —

"We trust that the length of Mr. Sumner's speech will deter none from its perusal. It is what it professes to be, an examination of the institution of Slavery itself, — and we venture to say a more acute, comprehensive, exhaustive, and powerful exposition of the whole subject never was made. Whoever wants to understand what American Slavery is must read this speech ; whoever wants to make headway against the ripening public feeling by defending Slavery must first try to answer the arguments of this speech. If he does not, he will be in danger of imitating the folly of Senator Chesnut, and, through an exhibition of passion and scurrility, of becoming a living illustration of its truths. . . . . The nation has certainly been drifting into a too general acquiescence in the doctrine, upheld openly or insidiously by both factions of the Democratic party, that slaves are property, precisely like any other property known to the Common Law. Any utterance like this of Mr. Sumner's, which shall call the American people from this disgraceful and dangerous conclusion, may well be generously criticised in other respects."

The *New Bedford Mercury* had the following, in a letter from Boston.

"The chief event of interest, certainly to Bostonians, lately, is the astonishing speech delivered by Charles Sumner, in his place in the Senate, in which he takes up the Slavery Question precisely where he left it off, when stricken down by the cane of the deceased bully Brooks. Offensive as that speech proved to the Slave-Masters, this one is ten times worse. This speech, for the first time in the history of Congressional speeches, sets forth, without the slightest veil or mincing of the matter, the deformities, obliquities, and immoralities of the Slavery system."

The *Albany Evening Journal* said : —

"On the 22d of May, four years ago, we were startled with the news that

Charles Sumner had been struck down in the Senate Chamber and nearly killed. Yesterday, for the first time since that event, his eloquence again enchained the attention of the Senate. The speech which provoked the assault in 1856 has been more than matched in the one just delivered. The former speech was read by millions, and the last is undoubtedly destined to receive a still wider attention. The glowing eloquence and surpassing erudition of Mr. Sumner give to all his speeches an attraction difficult to resist, even by those who dislike the doctrines he proclaims. His last speech is characterized not only by his usual brilliancy of style, but contains a striking array of facts and statistics which must have cost much patient toil in collecting."

The *Hartford Evening Press* said : —

"It is said in certain quarters that it would have been more politic to have left the speech unspoken. It is even urged by a leading journal that the admission of Kansas is endangered by it. The fact is, that the journal knows — none know better — that the Kansas Bill stands just as good a chance at the hands of Southern Senators to-day as if Charles Sumner had bent low and with bated breath begged the admission of that Territory as a favor, instead of demanding it as a right. . . . . The speech is demanded by the progress of the assumptions of Slavery. It boldly sets itself up as divine in origin, Christian in practice, the best form of civilized society, and challenges our scrutiny and approbation. This, taken in connection with its extraordinary interpretation of the Constitution as a charter of Slavery, and not of Freedom, as we have all along supposed it to be, forces the discussion upon us. Let us thank Heaven that we have men bold enough to take up the gauntlet. Charles Sumner deserves well of the country and well of the age, for his calm and masterly exposition of the true character of that system we are urged to accept and extend, as divine in appointment, and adapted to the wants of our time."

The *New Yorker Abendzeitung*, a German paper at New York, published an elaborate leader, translated by the *Evening Post*, of which this is an extract : —

"The oration made by Mr. Sumner is not a mere speech in the common meaning of the term, but rather a thoroughly digested treatise, carefully prepared, on the basis of a great number of facts and quotations. It unites the most thorough-going philosophical research, regardless of the conflict of its results with the nearest practical aims, to that variegated poetical coloring, which, appealing to the power of imagination, is an indispensable element of an efficient speech. Even to the best speeches of Senator Seward Sumner's speech stands in proportion as an oil painting of richest coloring and most dramatic grouping of figures to a mere black crayon etching. If Mr. Sumner's speech had been uttered before the meeting of the Chicago Convention, he would undoubtedly have occupied a prominent rank among the candidates of the radical portion of the Republican party."

The *Sunday Transcript*, of Philadelphia, said : —

"The greatest speech of the season is certainly Charles Sumner's magnificent philippic against 'The Great Barbarism.' The learning and research, the array of facts, the apt and eloquent quotations, the striking illustrations, and the vivid imagery of the oration are its least merits. The style and diction are as clear as crystal, as pure as water, and sonorously musical. The entire tone of the speech is dignified and lofty. . . . .

"Indeed, we admire his courage, his unequalled moral *pluck*. In this day of compromise and timidity, of bated breath and base concession, when it is the loathsome fashion to say that the Slavery Question should be discussed only as a matter of profit and loss, it is refreshing to hear a Senator speak in the spirit of Jefferson and the Fathers. Besides, does not the South challenge us to discuss the abstract question? Do not Benjamin, Toombs, Stephens, Curry, Keitt, Lamar, Hunter, Slidell, Brown, Hammond, Chesnut, Mason, Pryor, Clingman, Fitzhugh, and *all* the Southern politicians, discuss the question of Slavery in the abstract? Do they not deliver long arguments to prove that Slavery is right, just, benign, civilizing, and necessary, — that it is the proper condition of the negro and the working-man? And is any free Northern man so poor a poltroon as to say that these men shall not be *replied to*? What! shall all the South be privileged to praise and applaud Human Slavery, and not even Charles Sumner be allowed to *describe it as it really is*?"

The *Daily Democrat*, of Chicago, said : —

"This is the great speech of the day. It paints American Slavery as it is, and as it has never been painted before. No Republican can look upon the picture which Charles Sumner draws of this Barbarism without feeling his heart swell with hatred against it, and without recording a new vow to labor unceasingly for its extinction."

Early in the controversy *Frederick Douglass's Paper* bore testimony as follows.

"At last the right word has been spoken in the Chamber of the American Senate. Long and sadly have we waited for an utterance like this, and were beginning at last to despair of getting anything of the sort from the present generation of Republican statesmen; but Senator Sumner has now exceeded all our hopes, and filled up the full measure of all that we have long desired in the Senatorial discussions of Slavery. He has dared to grapple directly with the Hell-born monster itself. It is not the unreasonableness of the demands of Slavery, not the aggressions nor the mere arrogance of the Slave Power, insufferable and unconstitutional as these have been, that have now so thoroughly aroused the soul and fired the tongue of the learned and eloquent Senator of Massachusetts, but the inherent and brutal barbarism of Slavery itself. . . . His manner of assault is, we think, faultless. It was calm, self-poised, earnest, brave, and yet com-

pletely guarded. The network of his argument, though wonderfully elaborate and various, is everywhere, and in all its parts, strong as iron. The whole slaveholding Propaganda of the Senate might dash themselves against it in a compact body, without breaking the smallest fibre of any of its various parts."

The *Liberator*, in an editorial article by William Lloyd Garrison, said : —

"Throughout, its spirit was lofty, dignified, and bold, indicative of high moral intrepidity and a noble purpose. No attempts were made to interrupt him, though the smothered wrath of the Southern members must have been excessive."

The correspondent of an Antislavery paper, with the initials W. P., in an article entitled "Mr. Sumner's Last and Greatest Speech," said : —

"The Massachusetts Senator has led a column into this fortress, which, in the name of God and Humanity, must eventually silence all its guns and level its last stone to the ground. Neither statesman nor philanthropist has ever, in like manner, rent asunder the veil and exposed to the view of an outraged people the Barbarism of Slavery. This Mr. Sumner has done, *and no man can undo it.* 'What is written is written.' Slaveholders may rave, Americans may ignore, Republicans may deplore, but the speech and the name of Charles Sumner will live and be praised when the death-pall of oblivion shall cover the last vestige of these unhappy men."

The *Independent*, of New York, said : —

"The world will one day acknowledge the debt of gratitude it owes to the author of this masterly analysis. For four hours he held a crowded audience in attention, including large numbers of Southern people, members of Congress, and others."

The *Antislavery Standard*, of New York, said : —

"Nothing like it, in elevation of tone and width of scope, had ever before been heard in that Chamber. It was worth, to the author, to the cause, and to the country, all that it cost to produce it. For Mr. Sumner it was a great triumph and a revenge. And yet there was nothing vindictive in its tone or spirit. The 'bitterness' which is ascribed to it was in its truth. No doubt it stirred the malignant passions of the Slave-Masters to the deepest depths; but the fault was theirs, not his. His facts were unquestionable, his logic beyond the reach of cavil, and his rhetoric eminently becoming and self-respectful."

While newspapers were discussing the speech, and Republicans were differing, the Legislature of Massachusetts threw its weight into the scales by the adoption of resolutions, entitled "Resolves relating to

Freedom of Speech," containing the following support of Mr. Sumner.

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of the people of this Commonwealth are due and are hereby tendered to the Honorable Charles Sumner for his recent manly and earnest assertion of the right of free discussion on the floor of the United States Senate, and we repeat the well-considered words of our predecessors in these seats in approval of 'Mr. Sumner's manliness and courage in his fearless declaration of free principles and his defence of human rights and free institutions.'

"*Resolved*, That we approve the thorough, truthful, and comprehensive examination of the institution of Slavery embraced in Mr. Sumner's recent speech; that the stern morality of that speech, its logic, and its power command our entire admiration; and that it expresses with fidelity the sentiments of Massachusetts upon the question therein discussed."

The meaning of these resolutions was not left doubtful by the mover, J. Q. A. Griffin, who, after alluding to "certain Conservative Republican newspapers, such as the *New York Times* and the *Courier and Enquirer*, declaring that Mr. Sumner does not represent the Republican party in any degree," said, "It is necessary that Massachusetts should uphold her Senator."

The conflict of opinion in the American press showed itself abroad. The London *Times* took the lead in opposition. Its New York correspondent, entitled "Our own Correspondent," in a letter dated June 6, said of the speech: "A more studied insult to Southern slaveholding members, who compose nearly one half of the body in which the speech was delivered, a more vituperative attack upon the institution, a more bitter, galling, personal assault, or one more calculated to excite the worst feelings, can hardly be imagined." Then quoting certain passages without explanation or context, and asking the reader to "bear in mind that one half of the gentlemen who listened to him were slaveholders," the New York correspondent adds, "These extracts are sample bricks of the whole structure."

The *Times* itself followed in a leader of June 18, where the tone of its New York correspondent was reproduced; and here is the beginning of those attacks on the Antislavery cause in our country for which this journal became so famous during the war. An extract will show its character.

"We must, in the name of English Abolitionism at least, protest against these foolish and vindictive harangues. Scarcely has the frenzy caused by John Brown's outrage begun to die away than out comes Mr. Sumner with a speech which will set the whole South in a flame. We can well believe

that the prospects of the Republican party have been already damaged by it. Mr. Sumner is one of that class of politicians who should be muzzled by their friends. The man who can in personal irritability so forget the interests of a great cause is its worst enemy. Slavery existed on the American Continent long before the assembly of which Mr. Sumner is a member. On it depends, or is supposed to depend, the prosperity of half the Union; the looms of Lancashire and Normandy, as well as those of Mr. Sumner's own State, are supplied by slave-grown cotton, and hundreds of millions of Northern dollars are invested in slave-worked plantations. Slavery, with its roots thus deep in the soil, is not to be rooted up by any peevish effort of rhetoric; and we may predict that the man who first gains a victory for the cause of Abolition will be of very different temper to the Senator from Massachusetts."

The London *Morning Star*, of June 20, replied at length, and with much feeling. Here is an extract: —

"Who invested the *Times* with the functions of the organ of English Abolitionists? Who authorized the hoary charlatan of Printing-House Square to speak authoritatively in the name of the advocates of negro emancipation, and, as their assumed representative, to bespatter with its venom one of the noblest champions of that holy cause? Assuredly not the men of whom, with the mendacious arrogance which has become to it a second nature, it now pretends to be the appointed spokesman. Let it canvass, if it will, the whole legion of British sympathizers with the groaning slaves in the Southern States of America; it will be puzzled to find one whom its coarse and unprincipled attack upon Mr. Sumner has not inspired with sentiments of mingled indignation and disgust. . . . .

"We are convinced, that, throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom, the noble speech of Mr. Sumner will awaken reverence for his valor, admiration for his eloquence, and sympathetic esteem for his genial sympathy for the down-trodden slave; at any rate, we believe that there is but one journal whose inveterate malignity would inspire it to heap censure upon conduct which cannot be rewarded by too abundant homage."

The London *Morning Advertiser* also replied at length. Here is a specimen: —

"We are not satisfied with a contemporary who chooses to describe the noble oration of Senator Sumner as 'a vituperative attack,' as 'a bitter, galling, personal assault.' It is full of noble and manly thoughts, expressed in terms of becoming strength, but not too strongly, considering the magnitude of the evil against which it is directed, and the determination of the party by whom it is maintained."

The London *Daily News*, of June 22, followed.

"The barbaric character of Slavery, and of its supporters, has been abundantly exhibited through the press of some Northern States, but it has

never before been displayed in the Senate; and all criticism of it is excluded from the Southern press, and from most of the Northern. In the progress of the revolutionary conflict, the moment has arrived for the truth to be told in the Senate; and Mr. Sumner, as the representative of the most venerable State of the Union, was the man to utter it. He described the character of Slavery; he proved its operation upon the liberties of communities and the character of individuals; and he declared the resolution of the Free States to get rid of the evil of being implicated in such a barbarism, and to save every new community from being cursed with it against its will."

Then came *Punch*, July 21st, which said: —

"Mr. Sumner's speech was chiefly characterized by its closeness of argument and lucidity of diction; but he occasionally introduced a passage of highly wrought eloquence, or an image of singular vividness; and in England, however the orator's sentiments might have been objected to by a political antagonist, Mr. Sumner would have received the compliments of gentlemen of both sides upon so remarkable an exhibition of sustained power and intellectual skill. . . . .

"Mr. Punch begs leave to offer his respectful congratulations to Mr. Sumner upon his magnificent speech, and even more earnestly upon the ample and perfect testimony that was instantly given by the besotted slave-owners to the truth of his assertion of the Barbarism of Slavery. It is not often that an orator's enemies are in such a desperate hurry to prove his case for him. But here he was scarcely down, when the Slave party rushed together to proclaim themselves the ruffians he had painted them, and in the published copy of the oration Mr. Sumner has given at once the calmest and the deadliest blow to the system he denounces, — for he prints Mr. Chesnut's speech. All the bludgeons in the hands of all the 'chivalry of the South' cannot beat that demonstration of Mr. Sumner's case out of the heads of the public in and out of the States. The speech should be reprinted in England, and circulated in thousands. What is the Antislavery Society about?"

To these London articles may be added passages from Miss Martineau's correspondence with the *Antislavery Standard*, of New York. In a letter under date of July 2, the eminent writer said: —

"I may just say that Senator Chesnut's commentary on Mr. Sumner's speech is very amusing here. He cannot know much of the English aristocracy, if he supposes that strangers can get at them by their back doors. Their back doors are well looked to; but in Mr. Sumner's case there was no question of back door or front. Our aristocracy went out to seek him, — not he them. I need not say that we heartily rejoice in the full truth having been spoken in Congress. The occasion brings back vividly to my memory Mr. Calhoun's countenance and voice, when he insisted to me, peremptorily putting down all argument, that that day would never come: there would be silence about Slavery in Congress world without end. This

was in 1835. It must be also needless for me to say that no unprejudiced man or woman here really supposes that any terms can be kept with Slavery and Slaveholders. The crisis of your revolution may be precipitated by such open defiance in the Federal Legislature; but we see that it was the South which brought on the revolution and uttered the defiance, and that the only course for the Senator from Massachusetts is to take care that the revolution is steered straight by compass while there is such a fearful tampering with the helm. To speak gingerly of Barbarism, when his business was to set before his country the choice between Barbarism and Civilization, was, of course, impossible; and there could be no fidelity short of such a thorough exposure and denunciation as he has offered."

Then, under date of July 16, Miss Martineau wrote again :—

"Since I wrote last, we have had the opportunity of reading Mr. Sumner's speech entire. I know no instance in which it was so necessary to have read the whole in order to understand any part; and certainly I can recall no case in which careless and conceited critics have cut a more wretched figure in condemning a production before they understood it. They supposed themselves on safe ground, when they cited passages of denunciation, leaving (as such isolated passages must) an impression that the speaker had outraged the principles and spirit of legislative debate by personal imputation and provocation to passion. Mr. Sumner's own friends here regretted what they saw, simply because personal accusation and insult can never do any good, and must, in a crisis like that of your polity, render a complete rupture inevitable. As soon as we got the whole speech, however, the aspect of the quoted paragraphs was entirely changed. Instead of a piece of stimulating invective, we find the speech to be a chapter of history, and an exposition, calm and rational, of the workings of a social institution which is brought forward for discussion, and so placed on its trial, by Mr. Sumner's opponents. To me it appears a production of altogether incalculable importance, apart from its merits in detail. Till now, if we could have met with such a phenomenon in England as a person who was not convinced of the wickedness and folly of Slavery, we should not have known where to turn for a compact, reliable, serviceable statement of the modern case of slave and free labor."

Another testimony, purporting to be "by a distinguished writer of England," appeared in the American papers at the time.

"Thanks, many thanks, for Sumner's noble speech. It has been read with swelling throats and tearful eyes. It is a mighty effort towards wiping out the monstrous blot that disfigures your fair country. I like well the way in which he takes head after head of the foul Hydra, and severs each as completely as ever Hercules did; yet his labor was child's play in comparison."

To this English list may be joined a poem prompted by this speech. The New York *Independent*, where it first appeared in our country,

announced that the initials subscribed to it were those of Mrs. L. W. Fellowes, a daughter of Rowland Hill, originator of the cheap postage system in England.

"TO CHARLES SUMNER.

"As one who wandering lone is sudden stirred
With a wild gush of hidden woodland singing,
Doth picture to himself the beauteous bird
That with sweet concord sets the greenwood ringing,
And gazes eager round, and is full fain
To mark the warbler fair, yet gazes still in vain, —

"So I, being melted to my inmost soul
By this thy noble plaint for Freedom's sake,
Do grieve that ocean-tides between us roll,
And that I ne'er can see thee strive to break
The shackles, e'en more harsh than those that bind
The slave-born limbs, — the shackles of the mind.

"Go on, brave heart! and faint not, though thy way
Be rough and rude, and torn with many a thorn:
All England would thee hail, if some white day
Thou, harassed by thy country's bitter scorn,
Shouldst seek our friendly shore, and rest awhile
Thy wearied soul in this our happy Isle.

"L. W. F

"WOLVERHAMPTON, ENGLAND."

This speech took its place in foreign bibliography. French writers who discussed American Slavery cited it, among whom was that excellent ally of our country, M. Édouard Laboulaye, who wrote always with equal knowledge and friendship. After quoting the famous words by which Wesley describes and blasts Slavery, he gives a definition from this speech.

"The Americans of the North, who calculate even to the beatings of the heart, have summed up this multifold crime in five axioms. It is, say they, man become the property of his fellow-man, marriage abolished, paternity destroyed, intelligence systematically stifled, labor forced and unpaid, — in other terms, tyranny, confiscation, and robbery. Such are the essential vices of Slavery, vices independent of the goodness or the wickedness of the master, vices irremediable, — for to correct them is to acknowledge that the Slave has some rights, it is to make a man of him, it is to commence emancipation. Such, without exaggeration and without declamation, is the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' as the eloquent Senator of Massachusetts has justly called it."

The able Frenchman then adds in a note: —

"Mr. Sumner is the Senator who was struck down in the Senate Chamber by a colleague from the South, for which the assailant received a cane of honor, awarded by his admirers at the South. The welcome which Mr. Sumner in turn received in England and France, where he came to reëstablish his health, must have proved to him how much on the Old Continent are still esteemed courage and talent put forth in the service of humanity." [1]

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE testimony of correspondents was in harmony with the Anti-slavery press. Both in character and number, their letters were of singular authority. They show the sentiments of good men, and the extent to which the country was absorbed by the question of Slavery, although politicians sought to put it out of sight. And since this discussion culminated in war, they throw light on the origin of that terrible conflict, and therefore belong to history. Brief extracts are given from a portion of the letters within reach.

There can be no better name for the beginning than John G. Whittier, the poet, who wrote from his home at Amesbury, Massachusetts: —

"I have just finished reading *the* speech. It is all that I could wish for. It takes the dreadful question out of the region of party and expediency, and holds it up in the clear sun-blaze of truth and reason, in all its deformity, and with the blackness of the pit clinging about it. In the light of that speech the civilized world will now see American Slavery as it is. There is something really awful in its Rhadamanthine severity of justice; but it was needed.

"It especially rejoices thy personal friends to see in the speech such confirmation of thy complete restoration to health and strength of body and mind. It was the task of a giant."

Frederick Douglass, once a slave, wrote from Rochester, New York: —

"I wish I could tell you how deeply grateful I am to you, and to God, for the speech you have now been able to make in the United States Senate. You spoke to the Senate and the nation, but you have a nobler and a mightier audience. The civilized world will hear you, and rejoice at the tremendous exposure of the meanness, brutality, blood-guiltiness, hell-black iniquity, and barbarism of American Slavery. As one who has felt the horrors of this stupendous violation of all human rights, I venture thus far to trespass upon your time and attention. My heart is full, Sir, and I could pour out my feelings at length, but I know how precious is your time. I shall print every word of your speech."

[1] La Guerre Civile aux États-Unis: Études Morales et Politiques, p. 259.

Hon. S. P. Chase, afterwards Chief Justice of the United States, wrote from Columbus, Ohio : —

"Your great speech came to me, under your frank, this morning. I had read it all — in the *Bulletin* of Philadelphia, in the *Times* of New York, and in the *Globe* — before I received the pamphlet copy. It is gratifying to know that the *New York Herald* also prints it, and that, through various channels of publication, it will reach every corner of the land, '*cogens omnes ante thronum.*' '*C'est presqu'un discours antique,*' said a French gentleman to me last Saturday. I say, '*C'est bien plus.*'"

Hon. Francis Gillette, an Abolitionist, and formerly Senator of the United States from Connecticut, wrote from Hartford : —

"I cannot tell you how pleased I am with your late speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' It makes a lustrum in the Senate, and an era in the history of the Antislavery cause. But I am afraid the bloodthirsty barbarians are intent on assassinating you. Look out for them, and when they apologize to you with the pretension of drunkenness, understand them to mean they are drunk with rage. Do not believe them."

Hon. Carl Schurz, the German orator, afterwards Senator of the United States from Missouri, wrote from Milwaukee, Wisconsin : —

"Allow me to congratulate you on the success of your great speech. It did me good to hear again the true ring of the moral Antislavery sentiment. If we want to demolish the Slave Power, we must educate the hearts of the people no less than their heads."

Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, so long a champion of Freedom in Congress, wrote from his home at Jefferson, Ohio : —

"Permit me to congratulate you. My heart swells with gratitude to God that you are again permitted to stand in the Senate and maintain the honor of a nation and of mankind. I dared not say to you how much I feared the effect of that excitement which I knew must attend you while speaking in the Senate. But now you have passed the most trying point, I hope no evil effects will result to your health; but, however health or life may be affected, you have again spoken."

Then again the veteran champion wrote : —

"Of all the subjects before you, no one was so well adapted to the occasion as the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' And no man was so well adapted to the subject as yourself. I was profoundly grateful that you succeeded in pronouncing the speech, — and still more so, when I read it. It is worthy of yourself. Thus far my desires and prayers in regard to you have been fully met. May your services to your country and mankind continue so long as life continues!"

Hon. George W. Julian, another champion in Congress, wrote from his home at Centreville, Indiana : —

"I am exceedingly rejoiced that you have made your great speech, and said just what I understand you have said about the whole question of Slavery. But I grow sick, indignant, and nervous, on reading the cowardly notices of the speech by windy Republican journals."

Hon. John Jay, afterwards Minister to Austria, wrote from New York : —

"I wrote you hastily my congratulations and thanks on your last powerful effort, the effect of which I think will be stupendous and permanent, giving a vigor to the cause, and a definiteness to the opinion of the North, and an example of pluck more powerful in its persuasive influence than a thousand essays."

Hon. Gerrit Smith, always champion of the slave, wrote from his home at Peterborough, New York : —

"I have this day read your speech as it appeared in the *New York Times* of the 5th. God be praised for the proof it affords that you are yourself again, — ay, more than yourself! I say more, — for, though the 'Crime against Kansas' *was* the speech of your life, this *is* the speech of your life. This eclipses that. It is far more instructive, and will be far more useful, and it is not at all inferior to the other in vigor or rhetoric.

"The slaveholders will all read this speech, and will all be profited by its clear, certain, and convincing truths. The candid among them will not dislike you for it; not a few of them will, at least in their hearts, thank and honor you for it. Would that they all might see that there is no wrong, no malice whatever, in your heart! Would that they all might see that you do not hate the slaveholder, but pity him as the victim of a false education! . . . .

"I have read the editorial of the *Times* on your speech. It is more than unjust, it is wicked. Nor has the *Tribune*, so far as I have seen, any praises for you. But this is their way, or rather one of their ways, for promoting the interests of your Republican party."

Mr. Smith added in a subsequent letter : —

"I am scattering through my county the great speech of your life: I mean your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery. It is just to the taste of Republicans here, — for the Republicans here are nearly all Abolitionists."

Rev. John Pierpont, lifelong Abolitionist, and poet, wrote from the home of Gerrit Smith, whose guest he was : —

"I finished the reading of your great speech in the car on my way hither, and, permit me to say, thank you for it with my whole soul, — notwithstand-

ing the qualified commendations of it that may have found their way into some of the Republican papers."

Hon. Samuel E. Sewall, another lifelong Abolitionist, and able lawyer, wrote from Boston : —

"I rejoice that you have had the courage to exhibit in a systematic manner the essential barbarism of the institution. Everywhere I hear your speech spoken of in the highest terms of admiration. Even the most desperate conservatives are compelled to acknowledge your eloquence and ability. Nor do they deny the justice of your attack on the system of Slavery. But they say the time you chose for making this assault was inopportune and ill-judged, that it could only retard the admission of Kansas, that it is likely to have a bad effect on slaveholders, etc., etc., etc. It seems to me, however, that no occasion for denouncing an institution which is the ruin and disgrace of our nation can be inopportune."

William Lloyd Garrison, who gave his name to a school of Abolitionists, and was himself a host in constancy and lofty principle, wrote from Boston : —

"Allow me warmly to congratulate you upon your complete restoration to health, and upon the successful delivery of your great speech in Congress, the potency of which is seen in the writhings and denunciations of the slaveholding oligarchy and their base Northern allies, quite as much as in the commendations and rejoicings of your numerous friends and admirers."

Wendell Phillips, the orator of Freedom, and early friend, wrote : —

"I rejoice with a full heart, not only, not so much perhaps, in your glorious speech, as in what we so longed for and hoped, that you are again on your feet, again in harness, — it is so heart-stirring and cheering to hear your voice once more along the lines, and just now, too, when you and a very few others seem to embody all the real Antislavery there is in politics. Those were 'four' nobly used hours. 'T was a blast of the old well-known bugle, and fell on welcoming ears, and thankful ones."

Edmund Quincy, the accomplished writer and determined Abolitionist, wrote from Dedham : —

"The spirit moveth me to tell you how much I admired your speech of last Monday, the rather that I see that the dishes of skim-milk that you are trying to stir to an honorable action are turning sour to your word. The fact is, the leading Republicans not only don't know enough to go in when it rains, but they quarrel with the man that offers them an umbrella. . . . . I beg you to believe that the editors do not express the real feeling of the Republicans about your speech, as far as I have talked with them. The common people received it gladly; and its great power, eloquence, and ex-

haustive and unanswerable quality everybody acknowledges, even the enemy. You have done a good service to the country, and a great one to your party, if they have the sense to make use of it."

Lewis Tappan, the ancient and leading Abolitionist, wrote from New York : —

"The speech is timely and valuable. Everywhere I have heard it highly commended. Still some Republicans dislike it, at this crisis. But the party needs having their attention directed to the moral aspects of the question. May the good Lord protect and bless you, and enable you to feel a consciousness of his presence and inspiration ! "

J. Miller M'Kim, an active Abolitionist, who did much for the cause, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"The speech is in great demand here. Twenty-five cents a copy have been offered for the *Herald* or *Bulletin* containing it. I am disgusted with the notices of it which have appeared in some of the leading Republican prints. Maugre them all, I say, and all right-minded men will say, it was *judicious*, *well-timed*, and *german to the question before the country*."

Rev. Parker Pillsbury, the Garrisonian Abolitionist, who thought the Republican party too feeble, wrote from Cumington, Massachusetts : —

"Amid the profusion of epistolary plaudits you will doubtless receive for your late powerful protest against Slavery, a voice humble as mine can be to you only of slight account. And yet I cannot forbear my congratulations at your so far recovered vigor and health, and the cause of Freedom and Humanity, that it still receives the powerful aid and advocacy of your voice and influence. I only regret that a speech of such power as your last must be laid on the altar of Republicanism, while to the leaders of the party your utterances are distasteful, if not absolutely terrific."

Mrs. Maria Weston Chapman, the courageous Abolitionist, always faithful and intelligent, wrote from Boston : —

"Will you accept my hearty thanks for your speech? Exciting, as it must, a rage of hatred in some, proportionate to the love and gratitude it secures from others, I am sure your life is in danger; but with you, the greater the danger, the greater the courage, — and courage is preservative. No need to bid you be of good cheer : one in your place cannot help being so."

Rev. George B. Cheever, whose soul was in the Antislavery cause, wrote from New York : —

"I bless you from the bottom of my heart, and praise God for his goodness in sparing you and returning you to your place in the Senate for that great work. It is a mighty blow, struck just at the right time, with a sever-

ity, pungency, and hearty earnestness that it does one's very soul good to witness. God bless you, and keep you, my dear friend and brother! — for you must allow me to use this language, since you have endeared yourself to every lover of freedom and justice, of truth and righteousness, and to every friend of the slave, more than ever; and your noble course might justify even a personal stranger in addressing you thus. You are very dear to us all."

Rev. William H. Furness, the Unitarian preacher, whose gentle nature was always aroused by Slavery, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"I have just read the telegram of your speech, and I must tell you that I have no words to express my admiration, gratitude, love. It is a grand justification of your non-resignation of your seat. The grace of God is on you, — his special favor, in that you have had the will and the opportunity for so faithful, so noble an utterance. It is a planetary space beyond and above the Republican party."

In another letter he wrote further :

"I have no words to describe the blessed work you have done. Never for one instant mind the 'cold-shoulderism' of the *Tribune*, or the heartlessness around you; but rest assured that you have sent the truth into the inmost being of the Southern men who heard you. They may affect contempt by their silence, or they may rail and foam like Chesnut, but they know that you have spoken the bitter and biting truth without bitterness and without fear, as became a Christian gentleman. I declare to you that I consider that you are paid for the inaction and suffering of the last four years, and so are we. You cannot, no one can, begin to estimate the substantial work that you have done, both in regard to the essential truth, which you have demonstrated, and more to the perfect spirit and manner of the work."

Rev. O. B. Frothingham, the courageous clergyman and reformer, wrote from New York : —

'Expressing my satisfaction and delight with your recent speech in the Senate, I do not know which most to be thankful for, — the complete restoration of your physical and mental power indicated by it, or the unabated courage it manifests, or the undazzled moral vision it displays in every sentence. To read it is like inhaling a draught of air in midsummer from the cliffs of Nahant or the hills of New Hampshire. It gives a conscience to legislation, and sets us all back upon the everlasting truth and rectitude."

Rev. Nathaniel Hall, an excellent clergyman, beloved by all who knew him, wrote from Dorchester, Massachusetts : —

"Nobly you have dared to speak the truth, where to speak the truth, as you well knew, was to imperil life : I do not know in our day a nobler

instance of moral bravery. And the speech itself, so clear, so strong, so impregnable in its arguments, so unanswerable in its facts, so unexceptionable in its tone, so free from personalities (save where for truth's sake and the cause they must have been), so comprehensive, so conclusive, so great, so good, so Christian, so worthy, — yes, of a Christian statesman, — so lifted in tone and character above the utterances of that place, — my soul thanks you for it, — thanks God with added fervor, that he spared your life, and brought you back to your honored seat, and enabled you to such fidelity. It richly pays for these years of waiting. . . . . Whatever a partisan press may say, whatever political opponents and political *friends* may say, whatever of coolness and mistrust may be expressed, where you had a right to expect sympathy and support, be assured that deep in the hearts of multitudes of all parties you are honored, and will be by increasing numbers. I know it from what I know of human nature in myself. I know that my feelings *must* be shared. I know that the secret reverence not only of the true-hearted, but of all who have not sunk below the mark where appreciation of true-heartedness is impossible, must be given to him who has stood forth in the intrepidity of a Christian manliness, to declare, in the face and beneath the power of its violators, strong in power and reckless in deed, the eternal law of rectitude and mercy."

Rev. Convers Francis, the learned professor and stanch Abolitionist, wrote from Harvard University : —

"Thanks, many and most hearty thanks, for that great, very great speech, and for your kindness in sending it to me. What a portraiture of the Barbarism of Slavery! And what a master hand to draw it! Such a picture none but an artist of the highest order could paint. I must tell you, Mr. Sumner, that nothing on this great and fearful subject has ever so filled and satisfied my whole soul. 'Too severe,' say some; 'not good policy to irritate the South.' I tell them, Not an iota too strong. I would not have a single sentence or word less pungent or forcible, if I could; because every sentence and every word are loaded deep with truth, such truth as I rejoice that somebody is found in our Congress to give utterance to. . . . . You have done great and excellent things before, Mr. Sumner, but this, I must say, seems to me the greatest and most excellent of all. The abundance of facts from the most unquestionable sources, the admirable arrangement, the keen and searching application of the argument, the masterly logic, and the manly eloquence of the speech will make it a document of truth and righteousness for all coming time." [1]

Rev. John T. Sargent, Abolitionist and faithful reformer, wrote from Boston : —

"Every column of the paper, as I took it up, seemed to gleam on me like the golden lamps of the Apocalypse. How irresistible are your arguments!

[1] Further testimony of Professor Francis will be found in Weiss's *Discourse occasioned by the Death of Convers Francis, D.D.*, pp. 57, 58.

How pungent, and yet how Christian, your rebuke of this sore iniquity of our time! How sharp and clear goes the sword of your spirit through all the sophistry of your opponents! My soul has been in a glow all through the reading, and over the pathos of parts I have cried as if my heart would break."

Rev. Frederick Hinckley, Free-Soiler from the start, wrote from Lowell : —

"I write this hasty note to tell you how much I thank you (and I think the heart of New England thanks you, too) for your recent speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' in its moral tone and outspoken truthfulness so far above all other Republican speeches in Congress or Convention, carrying us back to the remembrance of the old Free-Soil times, when the party had more moral than political power, and, not expecting success, could speak right out."

Rev. Beriah Green, one of the most devoted among Abolitionists, wrote from Whitesborough, New York : —

"Such massive, enduring truth! uttered so clearly, definitely, fully! The argument so perspicuous, compact, conclusive! The illustrations so apt, so fresh, so sparkling! The conclusions so weighty, grand, impressive! Every paragraph pervaded, radiant, with scholarly beauty. When did literature, our own or other, ever more willingly, more generously, come, all vigorous and graceful, to the aid of any of her sons?

"I bless God, and thank you, for the deep-toned, comprehensive humanity which pervades, which consecrates and hallows your paragraphs. I found myself, as I moved on step by step through your trains of thought, quickened and encouraged, inspired and refreshed. The impression which the speech as a whole made upon my innermost spirit it is my privilege to cherish and retain. I shall, I trust, be more fraternal in my regards for all my fellows forever, for your brave, manly utterances. Blessings on your head, heart, and estate!"

Rev. Thomas C. Upham, author, professor, and devoted friend of Peace, wrote from Bowdoin College, in Maine : —

"Your history in Congress has been a providential one. I do most fully believe that the hand of God has been in it from the beginning. I thought that the blow which struck you down in the Senate was destined, through the overrulings of Providence, to break the chains of the slave, and I think so still. Allow me to congratulate you, in connection with multitudes of others, on your return to the country and the Senate, and on the utterance of great and true and kind words which will have an influence on the hearts of thinking men throughout the nation."

Rev. Henry M. Dexter, religious editor, and zealous historian of the Plymouth Pilgrims, wrote : —

"I cannot help feeling, my dear Sir, that you have made the most effective argument which the country has yet listened to on the general subject of the evils of that horrible system under which our nation is reeling like a giant poisoned by an adder. God bless you for your faithfulness, so calm, so dignified, so just, so overwhelming in its logical results, and grant that in 'the good time coming' your voice may often be lifted in that Senate House to more appreciative and coöperative auditors!"

Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, the eminent divine and eloquent preacher, wrote from New York: —

"My first duty as a Christian is to thank God that he has restored you to the Senate with physical and mental vigor equal to the great debate in which you have just borne so noble a part. My first duty as a patriot is to thank you for a speech which meets fully, squarely, ably, eloquently, conclusively, the one issue upon which our national welfare now depends. My first duty as a friend is to express the high satisfaction with which I have read the speech throughout, every line and letter of it, and the peculiar pleasure with which I have observed your self-control and avoidance of personalities under provocation, and your fearless and searching exposure of the barbarism and criminality of Slavery under the very eye of its bullying champions and in the very place where you had suffered its deadly malice. I am ashamed of the timid comments, almost deprecating indeed, of the *Tribune* and *Post* upon the only speech in the Senate which has reached the core of the question. If the Republican party is to seek success by blinking the real issue of the right or wrong of Slavery, I am prepared to witness its defeat without regret."

Rev. Thomas T. Stone, the persuasive preacher, and student of Plato, wrote from Bolton, Massachusetts: —

"It is scarcely necessary that I should tell you how much I thank you for your public deeds. I was one who wished your seat in the Senate empty, till either you filled it, or the inevitable doom removed you from the possibility of doing it. May the words which have ennobled it go forth as thunders, arousing souls now deadened by the barbarisms of our country and our age!

> "'Quo bruta tellus et vaga flumina,
> Quo Styx et invisi horrida Tænari
> Sedes, Atlanteusque finis
> Concutitur.'"[1]

Rev. Caleb Stetson, the Liberal clergyman, and early foe of Slavery, wrote from Lexington, Massachusetts: —

"It is the best and completest word that has yet gone forth on the subject. If another as good can be made, it must be by yourself."

[1] Horat. Carm. Lib. I. xxxiv. 9-12.

Rev. Rufus P. Stebbins, the Unitarian divine, wrote from Woburn, Massachusetts : —

" I have read your last speech in the Senate on ' The Barbarism of Slavery ' with admiration and gratitude. As a citizen, a constituent, I thank you from my heart's core. It was a glorious triumph, such as no Roman consul or general ever won, to stand in your place, after such a long absence, for such a cause, and through four long hours proclaim such holy truth in such distinct language as was never before heard on that floor. It is glory enough for one life."

Rev. William C. Whitcomb, an earnest clergyman and Abolitionist, wrote from Lynnfield Centre, Massachusetts : —

" A thousand thanks to you for your speech in Congress this week. 'T is the most thorough, satisfactory, and powerful speech I have ever read on the subject of Slavery, or any subject. 'T will secure millions of readers, and I trust open the eyes of the nation to the ' Barbarism of Slavery.' Ever think of me, and the people to whom I preach, as among your warmest admirers, lovers, and sympathizers."

Rev. David Root, retired clergyman and Abolitionist, wrote from Cheshire, Connecticut : —

" Though approaching seventy, such is my heartfelt interest in the cause you advocate, that I could cry with joy over the thought that there is at least one member in Congress who is able, and who has the moral courage, to do justice to that great enormity, that atrocious wickedness, that deep and damning crime of Slaveholding. You seem to have embraced in your speech the whole subject, in all its important departments, and with a plainness, directness, pith, force, and pungency worthy of the highest commendation. It should be a permanent and standard document on that subject, and be perpetuated through all coming time, that other generations may look at it and learn to hate Slavery and love Liberty. . . . . Mind not what some timid croakers may say about being ill-timed or calculated to injure our Republican campaign. It is not so. You have given us just the document we needed, going down to the foundation."

Rev. Edgar Buckingham, an early schoolmate of Mr. Sumner, wrote from his parish at Troy, New York : —

" I congratulate you upon the fidelity and the courage which you have manifested; and though I do not rejoice in all severity, I rejoice always in the severity of truth, and I trust that the leaders of the Republican party will unanimously decide, that, not their expediencies, but God's opportunity, is always the test of the time in which truth is to be spoken."

Rev. J. S. Berry wrote from New York : —

" Allow me, though a stranger, to thank you in the name of Humanity for

the noble speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery' just delivered by you in the Senate, so just, so truthful, and *so timely*. I bless God that he has so far restored you, and brought you to 'this hour.' Thousands of hearts thrill with intense hatred of Slavery, as they read your startling disclosures of its workings; and the prayers of these same thousands, nay, millions, ascend to the Father of us all, that you may be long spared to show up the wickedness and inhumanity of the institution. I rejoice that not alone on political grounds do you attack the system."

Rev. Daniel Foster, pastor, Abolitionist, and pioneer in Kansas, wrote from the town of Sumner there : —

"I rise from the perusal of your speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery' with such feelings of affection and reverence for you that I must give my feelings and emotion vent by a word of thanks to you. I was grievously disappointed in ———'s speech. Yours fully satisfies me, it is so thorough, exhaustive, forcible, and withal so lofty and noble and patriotic in its spirit."

T. Dwight Thacher, journalist, and Kansas pioneer, wrote from Lawrence : —

"Allow me, though an entire stranger, to express my thanks for the delivery of your recent great speech in the Senate of the United States. You may rest assured that the true, radical, Free State men of Kansas have no kind of sympathy with those who are so solicitous lest that speech should have injured our prospects for admission. We have learned the Slave Power well enough to know that its schemes of injustice toward us are not the offspring of sudden and transient excitements, but are the deep and well-settled purpose of years. And for one I would rather that we should remain out of the Union forever than that a single utterance in favor of Freedom should be suppressed in the Senate."

H. R. Helper, of North Carolina, afterwards Consul at Buenos Ayres, author of the work entitled "The Impending Crisis," wrote from New York : —

"I am in ecstasies with your speech of yesterday. Every word is put just where it was most needed. One such speech at intervals of even four years is worth incomparably more than a *Globe* of ordinary debate every day."

Theodore Tilton, the eloquent lecturer and journalist, sent this good word from New York : —

"I hasten to offer you my congratulations, not merely as a personal friend, but as a citizen, for your vindication of Liberty. Since the Senate began its sessions, no speech has been made on the floor which has satisfied me except this. I am glad that you have been neither intimidated to

silence nor hallucinated by 'expediency' into speaking only half the truth."

Francis H. Upton, lawyer, and author of the work on "The Law of Nations affecting Commerce during War," wrote from New York : —

"Thank God that you are yet stanch and strong, and in all things fit for the fight that is before us. I have no sympathy with those who prate of the *impolicy* of your present utterance, and also suggest the possibility of its influencing Senators to obstruct or postpone the admission of Kansas. It seems to me that he is but an ill observer of the signs of the times, and has not his finger upon the nation's pulse, who fails to perceive that the day of soft words and bated breath and candy-tongued conciliation is gone, and gone forever. Slavery has seen its last triumph, and henceforth should receive no quarter."

Hon. William Curtis Noyes, the eminent lawyer and exemplary citizen, wrote from New York : —

"I thank you cordially for your speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery'; and I thank you still more for having delivered it in the Senate, where you had a right to speak, and were bound to speak upon that subject first of all upon your restoration to health. Allow me also to congratulate you on that event, so auspicious to yourself and your country."

Hon. John Bigelow, the able journalist, and afterwards Minister to France, wrote from New York : —

"I have not found an opportunity until to-day of reading your speech about the Barbarism of Slavery. It is the best arranged and by far the most complete exposure of the horrid rite of Slavery to be found within the same compass in any language, so far as known."

Hon. Hiram Barney, for many years an Abolitionist, Collector of the Port of New York under President Lincoln, wrote from New York : —

"I was mortified to see in some of our Republican papers unkind criticisms on the expediency of such a speech at this time. In my judgment it is the best speech you have ever made. It was made at the best moment practicable to make it, and it would have been a wrong to the country and the cause to have withheld it. Moreover, it was made by the right man in the right place. It is the most valuable Antislavery document that I have ever seen."

Thomas Hicks, the artist, wrote from New York : —

"I have just read your speech. It is solid with fact, eloquence, and courage, — right in matter, place, and time."

Alfred Willard, a strong Republican, wrote from New York : —

"The South Carolina Senator spoke truly, in saying your speech was 'characteristic.' It was so indeed, not only of yourself, but glorious old Massachusetts, whose happy fortune it is that her Senators dare speak boldly for Truth and Freedom. Sir, you spoke yesterday not for yourself alone ; thousands, ay, millions, of American citizens will sympathize to their hearts' core with every word so fearlessly spoken. As your speech was 'characteristic,' so also was the brief South Carolina response. . . . . Your speech will serve admirably, not only as a powerful and able argument for Freedom, but as a campaign document in the coming contest."

Professor Charles D. Cleveland, the accomplished teacher and early Abolitionist, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"Many, many heartfelt thanks to you, my dear friend, for your noble speech. It takes the only true ground, — the essential barbarism and sinfulness of Slavery. The few lines in reply to the infamous remarks of Chesnut were admirable, just the thing, and I hope his remarks and yours will go with the speech in its pamphlet form. What would I have given to hear it!"

E. M. Davis, merchant and constant Abolitionist, wrote from Philadelphia : —

"So many people will thank you for your timely, noble, and courageous speech that my thanks will hardly reach your ear; yet I must thank you for my own sake. Our family here spent the last three evenings in reading it out aloud, my son Henry being the reader, and you ought to know how sure we are now that you *are* well, and how thankful we are for it, and how much good this greatest of all your efforts will do."

Daniel L. Eaton, journalist, wrote from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania : —

"You must permit me, a perfect stranger, to express my cordial thanks to you for the noble, scathing speech on the 'sum of villanies' with which you enriched our literature on Monday last in the Senate. This contest is no holiday battle, but the irrepressible conflict between Right and Wrong. I thank my God that he has spared your life to tell the world that the bludgeon of Barbarism did not silence your tongue nor subdue your spirit. 'Let the Heathen rage.' Behind you stand a million of your fellow-citizens in whose hearts your speech finds an echo. After reading it through with scrupulous care, I could not resist the impulse to tell you what I have."

Thomas MacConnell, lawyer, wrote from Pittsburg : —

"I hold Slavery to be a curse and a disgrace to our country and to mankind; and I rejoice to know that we have one man who is not afraid to denounce it as such, in plain Anglo-Saxon, on the floor of the Senate, and in the face of the Slaveholders."

C. B. M. Smith, another lawyer, wrote from Pittsburg : —

"Will you permit a private in the Republican ranks to thank you for your great speech on the Barbarism of Slavery? I do not believe that it was ill-timed, or too severe. It was just what the occasion and the times called for."

Rev. N. Warren Everett wrote from Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania : —

"I have just been reading your masterly and unanswerable speech of the fourth instant with thrills of delight. Massachusetts can afford to let one of her Senatorial chairs remain vacant, if we can have such a speech as that once in four years. I feel like thanking God from the bottom of my heart that you have been restored to health, and have the nerve, or, as you once expressed yourself, the 'backbone,' to stand as one of God's noblemen and give utterance to truth."

Edward Corner wrote from Columbus, Ohio : —

"It is worth its bulk in gold. I honor the heart and give large credit to the head that combined to send forth such a document. If it could but reach the eyes and ears of the South generally, it would tell upon even that dark and ignorant people ; but it cannot ; a few may see it. There is not brass enough, nor yet iron, nor steel, in the Southern Senators to ward off such a blow. They will never forget it. There are some weak-kneed Republicans who wish the speech had been less severe. I believe in the entire speech. As you undertook to give the truth, why not tell the whole truth? It is time they were exposed ; it is time to hold up Slavery's mirror, not only to the South, but before the world."

Alanson St. Clair wrote from Muskegon, Michigan : —

"And if my memory is not greatly at fault, you are the first Member of Congress who has entered the penetralia of the Pandemonium, and fully exposed the diabolical character of the system, and the true character of its supporters. Such efforts are telling.

"The efforts of many noble patriots have been manly, self-denying, and praiseworthy, and should not be disparaged; and yet I know of no one who has taken the high moral ground on this subject which you have from the first. This, during your whole Senatorial career, has made you the hope of the reliable Antislavery men in America; and your last effort will increase not a little their reliance on and their affection for you. It is a godlike effort, a stunning blow, a blow in the right direction and upon the right spot, which has inflicted a fearful, if not a deadly wound. . . . . I pray God that you may live, and retain your place, to pronounce the funeral oration of Slavery, and to receive the exultant blessings of the millions to be set free."

Nathan C. Meeker wrote from Dongola, Illinois : —

"Notwithstanding what Mr. Greeley said as to its not being proper at this time, I think it timely, and that Mr. Greeley is not aware of the great prevalence of Antislavery sentiment, although he as much as any one has contributed to create it. I thank you for the bold words, and also for the pleasure I have received in reading a correct performance, since there are so many which are hard for me to read. I think your speech will long be referred to, as embracing all that has been and well can be said on this question, and forever cause men to wonder why it was listened to in silence."

Horace White, the able journalist, afterwards editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, wrote from Chicago: —

"I take pleasure in saying that in my opinion your recent effort ranks with Demosthenes on the Crown, and with Burke on Warren Hastings."

John H. Rolfe wrote from Chicago: —

"Nobly and well have you met the expectations of those who, like myself, have waited through four years of silence for your next utterance on the great sin of our times. Highly as I prize the speech, I think your brief and pointed reply to Senator Chesnut fully doubles its value, for all practical purposes."

W. H. Herndon, the able lawyer, associated in business with Abraham Lincoln, wrote from Springfield Illinois: —

"I have received and read your most philosophic, logical, and classical speech, made in the Senate of the United States. The speech is a withering one to Slavery. It is worthy of you, and you of it. I thank you very, *very* much for it. . . . . We feel well out here; are confident of success. We hope the East will do as well as the West."

S. M. Booth, journalist, who, spurning the Fugitive Slave Act, helped fugitive slaves, and was sentenced to imprisonment, wrote from "U. S. Custom-House Prison" at Milwaukee: —

"I bless God for the utterance. It is timely and needed at this juncture. I have no sympathy with that craven policy which would suppress such a speech, lest it might prejudice the rights of Kansas or endanger the election of Lincoln. . . . . Your portrait of Slavery is true; its character and effects are all you describe it; and the nation needs to have its own sin and shame mirrored as you have done it. I see, too, the assassins have since sought your life. . . . . You have struck a mighty blow at the very *existence* of Slavery. You have laid the axe at the root of the tree. We never can reach the evil as long as we fight on the defensive. But if the doctrines of your speech are true, it is no longer a question *where* or *how far* Slavery shall go, but whether it shall be allowed to go or to be *anywhere*. . . . . In God's name let it perish, and the sooner the better."

Hon. A. A. Sargent, delegate from California to the Chicago Convention which nominated Abraham Lincoln as President, and afterwards Representative in Congress from California, wrote from Newburyport, Massachusetts: —

"You go back of mere political distinctions to lay bare the sin and barbarousness of a hoary iniquity, falsely assuming to be a form of Civilization. You have taken up a train of thought, and pursued it well, which I have long wished to have developed, and filled a void in the system of declared truths upon which Republicanism is based, too long neglected. Your speech stirred my heart with feelings of pride for the representative of my native State."

Hon. Neal Dow, eminent in the cause of Temperance, and afterwards a general in the War, wrote from Portland, Maine: —

"You will be glad to know that among all thoughtful men of our side your speech is commended without a qualification. There is no sympathy with the cowardice of the mere politicians, in the fear that it may excite the bad passions of the South, and provoke them to do some dreadful thing. I think the general wish is that *the whole truth* should be boldly spoken, and that the crisis, whatever it may be, may come soon. The indications now are that the South will have an opportunity to make up its mind what it will do about it."

John Neal, the veteran of American literature, wrote from the same city: —

"I have just finished the reading of your great and conclusive speech upon the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' and I have only to say that I go with you heart and soul, and that I concur entirely in the opinion expressed by the venerable Josiah Quincy of your argument.

"Your manliness, your Christian forbearance, your plainness of speech, and your unexaggerating truthfulness are all of a piece, and I desire to thank you in the name of this whole generation for what you have done and suffered and said."

Hon. James S. Pike, also of Maine, for many years a journalist, afterwards Minister of the United States at The Hague, wrote from Cape May: —

"I think you have got hold of a heavy sledge, and hit between the horns at every lick. The style of treatment will do as much towards bringing the beast upon his knees as any other, and the duty is peculiarly appropriate at your hands. I am very sure you are right, and feel prompted to say so."

Hon. John Appleton, the learned jurist, and Chief Justice of Maine, wrote from Bangor: —

"I owe you thanks for your able and unanswerable speech, which came in my absence. More truth was never condensed in one speech. But woe to those by whom it so becomes the truth!"

Hon. Moses Emery, an eminent citizen, wrote from Saco, Maine: —

"Permit me to say I have read it through twice, and parts of it many times, and that I consider it the most glorious and most needed speech ever made in the United States. I rejoice that you have been spared to make it. But be on your guard. The Demon of Slavery will be revenged, if possible."

Thomas H. Talbot, a lawyer, who argued well against the Fugitive Slave Act, wrote from Portland, Maine: —

"I rejoice at your determination to tell the whole truth, so much needed now, when many acting with you either do not perceive it or are willing to withhold it, for reasons of false, fleeting policy. So far you seem not seriously to have been molested; and yet that you have really achieved freedom of speech in Washington upon that subject, and to the extent of your speech, seems almost too much to hope for at present."

Hon. Woodbury Davis, an earnest Republican, afterwards Justice of the Supreme Court of Maine, wrote from Portland: —

"Your friends here were alarmed on Sunday evening by a rumor that you had been attacked again by Southern ruffians. I felt thankful yesterday morning, when the despatches were published, to learn that it was no worse. I do not believe there is another man in the world for whose personal safety so much real prayer ascends to Heaven. . . . .

"Allow me, as one of the people, though not one of your immediate constituents, to thank you for your great speech. In these times, when there is a tendency to *let down* the great principles of Universal Liberty in order to gain a temporary triumph, it was so refreshing to have them so nobly and faithfully advocated in the great forum of the nation, that I felt truly grateful to you, and to Him who has preserved you for such a service. If Slavery is to be restricted, it is because of its own inherent wrong, *whereso-ever* and upon *whomsoever* it rests. And if wrong, we are bound not only to resist its extension, but by whatever powers we have to seek its extinction."

Professor Benjamin Silliman, distinguished in science and venerable in years, wrote from Yale College: —

"It is a terrible indictment, and supported by such an array of facts, that, having now gone to the jury, there can be no doubt as to the verdict, and a verdict without appeal, except to violence, — against which, as regards yourself personally, I trust you will exercise a ceaseless, although not a timid vigilance."

Cyrus R. Sanborn wrote from Rochester, New Hampshire : —

"After the many anxious inquiries during your long absence in a foreign land, your return to the Senate has been a topic of not much less interest. Upon the question often being asked, 'Shall we again hear from Mr. Sumner on the question of Slavery?' as often it would be answered either in the affirmative or negative. Not too late, just at *the* time, you have answered the whole question in your recent elaborate speech. Happy and delighted are freemen that the bludgeon and threats have not daunted your courage and freedom of speech upon the great question of Slavery."

John A. Andrew, afterwards the great Governor of Massachusetts, wrote from Boston : —

"Among the numerous congratulatory letters which your recent brilliant Senatorial effort is doubtless bringing to you, I doubt not you will derive some pleasure in being remembered at No. 4, Court Street.

"'The Philosopher'[1] and myself, as you know, always read you promptly and carefully. In this recent triumphant success I recognize the 'wonted fires' which have now these dozen years illumined our heavens. And I rejoice at the evidence of confirmed physical vigor which is assured by your encounter of the fatigues and excitement of such an intellectual exercise. May you live a thousand years!"

Hon. Francis W. Bird, one of the ablest and honestest politicians in Massachusetts, for many years an Abolitionist, and of peculiar influence, wrote from East Walpole : —

"You do not need that I should thank you for your speech. I confess I considered the risk to your health and life so great that I hoped you would keep silent. But I thank God you have gone through it, for now we may rest assured your health is established. But how I dreaded the test! I rejoice especially that you have placed yourself where the next step logically is, Slavery has no rights, no recognition (except as an existing fact), and no political existence under the Constitution. Then comes the end. And you are to be the leader in that final fight."

George L. Stearns, so faithful as Abolitionist, who did so much for the organization of colored troops during the War, wrote from Boston : —

"I cannot wait until I have finished your speech to tell you how perfectly it meets my most sanguine expectations. It is the morning star that heralds the coming day when the vile institution shall only live in the history of the Past. Your word will become the battle-cry in the coming conflict, showing that it is indeed irrepressible, and will not be put down, even when the leaders in the fight fall back in terror."

[1] Hon. Theophilus P. Chandler, who occupied an office with Mr. Andrew.

Hon. James M. Stone, afterwards Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and a reformer, wrote from Charlestown : —

"I am delighted with your admirable speech on the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' and I desire to unite with the millions of the freemen of the country in tendering you thanks for this effort to arouse the attention of the people to the terrible evils of Slavery. The power of your facts and logic is unanswerable and irresistible. The speech comes just at the right time, too; for there was great danger of too much forgetfulness of the great fundamental principle of Human Freedom, without which the Republican party would never have obtained its present power and prospects for the future, and without which it will surely and speedily go to destruction."

William I. Bowditch, the well-known conveyancer, and among the strictest of Abolitionists, wrote from Boston : —

"As to the speech, the more I think of it, the heavier I think the blow was which you have given. And I am glad to find you yourself again."

Nathaniel I. Bowditch, author, as well as eminent conveyancer, remarkable also for goodness and moral principle, wrote from Brookline : —

"I had not the least conception of the immense differences effected by Freedom and Slavery. Your statistics were truly astonishing. Some of my visitors, friendly in the main to the Republican cause, have expressed their doubts as to the expediency of your speech, — considering that its effect must be to exasperate the slaveholders; but when I find that Bell, nominated by the Union party, actually eulogized Slavery as the corner-stone of the material prosperity of the country, I think that it is well that the true picture should be held up to their inspection, however repulsive it may be. As in some homely picture of the Dutch school, such as that of *The Dentist pulling out a Tooth*, the subject may be distasteful, but all must acknowledge the skill of the artist, so I think no one can deny the thoroughness of your researches or the ability with which you have presented their results. Even your opponents cannot fail to acknowledge the manly and fearless tone of your remarks."

George Livermore, a Boston merchant, who loved books, and was always true to his convictions, wrote from Boston : —

"I have waited almost a fortnight since the first reading of your speech, and have read it again and again, before saying anything about it. I have heard the various remarks of many persons whom I have met, and have read the contradictory criticisms of politicians, philanthropists, and religionists. But the first thoughts and the first impressions on reading the speech have been strengthened by reflection. I could then find no words of my own so suitable to express my views respecting it as the words of the wise man of Israel, and I said more than once to my nearest friends, 'Here are *apples*

of gold in pictures of silver.' For if ever words were *fitly spoken*, it was when you so bravely, truly, and eloquently lifted up your voice in the Senate, and shamed the 'Barbarism of Slavery.' I thank you for it."

Charles W. Slack, able editor, and ever earnest against Slavery, wrote from Boston : —

"If the truth must be suppressed, if every honest aspiration must be crushed, if everything manly and heroic is to be tamed down, to win a Presidential contest, better be without the success, I say, than purchase it at such a sacrifice. Again I thank you, over and over again.

"Let me say that I know the newspapers don't represent the current tone of the Republicans in this community, even where bold and brave utterances heretofore have not been popular."

William S. Robinson, for many years Clerk of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and able journalist, who uttered what he thought, wrote from Boston : —

"I suppose that you are not disappointed that timid Republicanism in some quarters objects to the time and occasion of your speech. Of course its real objection is to the speech itself. But I assure you that the Anti-slavery men gladly welcome it. I regard it as your best speech, and as calculated to do immense good."

J. P. Blanchard, clear-headed, and vowed against Slavery and War, wrote from Boston : —

"I need hardly say that I share in the high admiration and satisfaction with which it is received by all intelligent persons here, except those few who have sold their souls for office, or who have not yet awoke from the political sleep of half a century. I esteem it especially, not so much for its great research and ability, which were expected, as because it discusses the true fundamental question of the wrong as well as evil of holding property in man, which, though the real issue between the parties, has hitherto been too much slurred over on both sides."

Seth Webb, Jr., appointed by President Lincoln Consul at Port-au-Prince, Hayti, a Republican of the best quality, and always Anti-slavery, wrote from his home in Scituate, Massachusetts : —

"I have read it with care. It is magnificent, and I am glad on every account that it was made. It was all needed, — needed now and from you. It not only expresses my own opinions fully, but in it you have written on the walls of Eternity the adamantine convictions of Massachusetts.

"That there are some timeserving and tremulous men and presses in our ranks who treat the speech coolly only shows that Republican leaders do not understand Republicanism, and that it is a mighty work to regenerate a nation.

"The strength of the Republican party lies in the fearless utterance of its opinions; its weakness, in the suppression of them. A timid policy will be our ruin; a bold one wins friends and awes enemies."

Hon. Amasa Walker, afterwards Representative in Congress, writer on Currency and Political Economy, and enlisted against Slavery and War, wrote from his home at North Brookfield, Massachusetts: —

"I do think it excellent and well-timed, just what you ought to say, and no more, — but what no other man in the Senate would have dared to say."

Hon. Willard Phillips, for many years Judge of Probate in Boston, and author of the excellent work on the Law of Insurance, wrote from Boston: —

"I was not a little chagrined and mortified by ———'s notice of it, as I expressed to him in a note the moment I had read his leader respecting it. Brutality, no less than vice, is a monster, and whoever paints it fair, or wishes others to, by the false character he gives betrays his own true character. I have great faith in plain-spoken truth; and the railing and gnashing of teeth in anger by the Southern preservers of the Union, and what John Randolph denominated as the white slaves of the North, who second them, is a plain confession of the truth as you have spoken it."

Hon. Albert G. Browne, prominent in the politics of Massachusetts, and ever foe to Slavery, wrote from Boston: —

"No poor words of mine can convey to you my admiration and hearty approbation of your speech. I greatly err in judgment, if it is not by universal consent considered your best effort in this direction. To my mind it is exhaustive of the subject."

Daniel Henshaw, a venerable citizen, once a journalist and always a reformer, wrote from Boston: —

"I have read your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery attentively, having devoted seven hours thereto yesterday, and I cannot refrain from offering you my humble thanks, although words cannot express my feelings on the subject. You know something of my views on Slavery. For thirty years I have considered it the leading and most important subject before the nation."

Charles M. Ellis, the lawyer, and always against Slavery, wrote from Boston: —

"Especially allow me to thank you for the discourse of the Barbarism of Slavery; for it shows you *well* again, and leading on the good fight. It is needed now, when men at the South seek to justify the thing, — needed, I think, more than anything, — and leaves little to be done in that direction."

Warren Sawyer, a merchant and active Republican, wrote from Boston : —

" I have looked over the newspaper reports, and have thanked God your life was spared to prepare such a masterly production, so full of facts, so happily arranged, so glowingly knit together, and that you were able in strength to stand up in the Senate and deliver it.

" To my mind, the speech will do much good; it was needed. The great mass of the people have become, or are becoming, what is now called conservative on the Slavery Question; they forget, amid their business and their many calls, the horrors, the crime, and the Barbarism of Slavery."

C. J. Higginson, a merchant, wrote from Boston : —

" Notwithstanding all that has been said and written on Slavery, I think you have first perceived and expressed this ' unconsciousness ' of slaveholders; and the additional fact of this unconsciousness being nearly as general at the North as South explains the necessity of proving at this late day, even to us of the North, the Barbarism of Slavery. We thought their wealth and leisure led them to be generous; nobody has ever so plainly shown their accepted necessity of meanness. We have been unconscious of their influence in lowering our standing. . . . . I only wish to express my satisfaction at finding Massachusetts again represented by a man with a constitution, so valuable in the latitude of Washington, capable of standing the burning heat of the South and the chilliness of the North."

Hon. J. Q. A. Griffin, the lawyer and earnest Republican, too early removed from life, wrote from Charlestown : —

" I must thank you for the great gratification I felt in the perusal of your great speech. Twice I have read the whole of it, and many times more various parts. It is small praise to say, what is here on all lips, that it evinces marvellous scholarship, and embraces a sternly logical statement of the whole question between Freedom and Slavery. Its amazing courage and justice will commend it yet more to the thinking men of this and all other countries."

George Baty Blake, the banker, wrote from Boston : —

" Its unanswerable arguments will stand forever as monuments of manly effort in behalf of an oppressed race, — defending principles, too, which ought to be approved by every Christian man."

A practical Republican, very active in the party, wrote from Boston : —

" I have read your splendid speech, and find that I cannot express in words or with pen my admiration of it. It is one of *your* efforts, the results of which will undoubtedly place our great party one more pace onward, as in every case of the past you have done. In my opinion it was needed at

this time; and as I have been something of a prophet in days past, perhaps my sanction may give you courage."

A considerable number of constituents at Boston, among whom were James Redpath, Richard J. Hinton, and Loring Moody, friends of Kansas, and Abolitionists, forwarded the following address, signed by them : —

"Jointly and severally, as men and as citizens, we say, God bless you, Charles Sumner! Thank God for one man whom no Barbarism frightens, whom no pusillanimous policy deters from uttering the truth! Thank Heaven that in our modern Sodom one just man and fearless was found, who, in the face of despots, has dared to plead the cause of their victims, and to brand their tyranny with the titles it has won!

"Go on, — with God, and the slave, and all good men applauding you. Victory is inevitable, and near at hand.

"With gratitude and love and admiration, your friends, constituents, and fellow-citizens."

Dr. Joseph Sargent, the eminent surgeon and strong Republican, wrote from Worcester, Massachusetts : —

"When I first read your speech, as I did immediately after its delivery, my blood boiled anew, as after the outrage which our country's Barbarism inflicted on you four years ago. God has punished that crime, in the persons of its more immediate perpetrators, in his own way. Your speech is the apt and condign punishment of that portion of the community who supported them. In its learning, its truth, and its eloquence, it is worthy of you; while in its comprehensiveness, its compactness, and its completeness, it has exhausted the whole subject. If you never say a word more, your record will be right, and may God bless you!"

Hon. James H. Morton, holding a judicial situation, wrote from Springfield, Massachusetts : —

"I have long been expecting to hear from you in your regaining health, and my expectation has been fully realized in the noble, scorching, withering expression of the true sentiment of Massachusetts on this subject. Would to God that every man who entertains the sentiments contained in your speech, whether of the North or South, had the moral courage boldly to express them! We should soon see an end of that accursed thing, Slavery."

Hon. D. W. Alvord, lawyer and warm Republican, wrote from Greenfield, Massachusetts : —

"I write to thank you for your recent speech. There is not elsewhere in the English language so powerful an argument on the Barbarism of Slavery. In my opinion it is just such a speech as you were bound to make, — just such a speech as the honor of Massachusetts required from you. It is such

a speech as few men living but you could make. Hurt the Republican party, will it? If it will, then the party does not deserve success."

Humphrey Stevens, Register of Deeds for Franklin County, Massachusetts, wrote from Greenfield: —

"I have just read your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery. God be praised that you did not compromise, and that the prayers of the good have been answered! Some Republicans may condemn, but hosts will rejoice that you regard the cause more than Republicanism."

Rev. William S. Tyler, the learned Greek Professor, wrote from Amherst: —

"I cannot refrain from expressing to you the deep, though in some respects painful, interest with which I have read your late speech in the United States Senate.

"That your life has been spared, your health in such a measure restored, and that you were able to begin 'where you left off,' and finish such a faithful and complete exposition of the monstrous Barbarism — that is the word — of American Slavery, is just matter of congratulation to the country, and of thanksgiving to God. The enemies of Freedom and Humanity will of course gnash their teeth upon you, and timid friends will question the expediency of such a speech; but when the passions and prejudices of the hour have passed away, it will be remembered and honored as one of the truest, greatest, best utterances of our age."

Hon. Henry Hubbard, the agent of Massachusetts to visit New Orleans in behalf of colored seamen imprisoned there, wrote from Pittsfield: —

"I cannot, even at the hazard of offending you, refrain from expressing the sense of honor and gratitude I feel for your sending me your immortal and all-conquering speech on the Kansas Question, showing and proving the unmitigated atrocity and monstrous deformity of Slavery, maintained in many States of this confederacy, and threatening all the rest. Boldly, manfully, faithfully you have 'done the austere work,' not letting, by your laches, 'Freedom fling away any of her weapons.' Oh, no! Freedom stood in all her majesty, and used all her weapons."

Henry D. Thoreau, author and man of genius, wrote from Concord, Massachusetts: —

"Especially I wish to thank you for your speech on the Barbarism of Slavery, which I hope and suspect commences a new era in the history of our Congress, when questions of national importance have come to be considered from a broadly ethical, and not from a narrowly political point of view alone. It is refreshing to hear some naked truth, moral or otherwise, uttered there, which can always take care of itself, when uttered, and of

course belongs to no party. (That was the whole value of Gerrit Smith's presence there, methinks, though he did go to bed early.) Whereas this has only been employed occasionally to perfume the wheel-grease of party or national politics."

Frank B. Sanborn, teacher and earnest man, afterwards an able journalist, wrote from Concord: —

"Whatever politicians and editors may say, or even think, you have more endeared yourself to the popular heart by your labors in the last Session than by all that you have previously done. Neither the North nor the South can soon forget the faithful picture held up before us in your speeches."

Miles Pratt, a business man and active Republican, of Watertown, Massachusetts, wrote : —

"I am sure I express the sentiments of nine tenths of the Republicans of this town, when I say that your speech is received with joy by us all. Strange that such papers as the *Tribune* can wish that it had been made at some other time! We don't want victory, if at such sacrifice as the *Tribune* proposes. Let me assure you that such sentiments as you have uttered are what keep very many men in the Republican ranks."

E. P. Hill, of Haverhill, Massachusetts, wrote : —

"Allow me to congratulate you upon the delivery of one of the most effective speeches upon the great question of the age that have ever been given to the American people. I rejoice most heartily that the facts and sentiments it contains have found a timely utterance, and it is safe to predict for it a decided effect upon the moral sense of the whole world."

P. L. Page wrote from Pittsfield, Massachusetts : —

"I have just read your speech, 'The Barbarism of Slavery,' and, notwithstanding the opinions of some politicians, am glad you have delivered it just as it is. It is terrible, but truthful. I think it will do good. While there is immense sympathy for the Republican party, as a party, there is too little sympathy for the Slave, and too little indignation against that abominable system by which he is held in bondage. The tendency of that speech is to show that it is not this or that measure merely we have to contend with, but the monster Slavery."

Andrew L. Russell, an excellent citizen, of Pilgrim stock, and an early Abolitionist, wrote from Plymouth, Massachusetts : —

"I have just read your speech with great interest, and thank you for it. It is just the thing, manly and conclusive. I hope in all the copies of your speech Mr. Chesnut's beautiful specimen of Southern Chivalry manners will be printed, with your rejoinder.

"We must be bold and determined now, and the victory is sure. The ravings of the Oligarchy show that they are wounded."

Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, of beautiful genius, and equal devotion to the cause, wrote from Wayland, Massachusetts: —

"I presume you were not disappointed that so many Republican editors pronounced your speech injudicious, ill-timed, etc. I was not surprised, though I confess I did expect something better from the *New York Evening Post*. Honest utterance generally frightens or offends the wise and prudent; but it gains the popular heart, and thus renders political parties the greatest service, though it is one they least know how to appreciate. They themselves are also carried onward by such agencies, as certainly as cars follow the engine."

From representative colored men similar testimony proceeded. That of Frederick Douglass has been given already. Robert Morris, the colored lawyer, wrote from Boston: —

"In behalf of the colored young men of Boston, and following the dictates of my own heart, I write to thank you for the speech you have just made in exposition of the Barbarism of Slavery. . . . .

"In battle, when a bombshell is thrown into the camp of the enemy, if it creates consternation and surprise, rest assured it has been thrown successfully, and done good service. So your speech, every word of which is truthful, fearlessly spoken to the guilty parties in the iniquitous system of Slavery, was properly directed, and has done good service, as is fully demonstrated by the renewed attempts on the part of the Southerners to assault you again and silence your voice."

John S. Rock, also a colored lawyer, afterwards, on motion of Mr. Sumner, admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, wrote from Boston: —

"Your immortal speech has sent a thrill of joy to all the lovers of Freedom everywhere, and especially so to the down-trodden. We feel the value of it the more since the Republican party appears determined to treat us in the spirit of the Dred Scott decision."

J. B. Smith, colored, of New Bedford, wrote from Boston: —

"Permit me, as a citizen of your native State, and especially as a colored man, who has faithfully devoted more than twenty years of his brief life to the elevation of his race, most sincerely and heartily to thank you for your very masterly speech in exposition of the monstrous iniquity of American Slavery. I can assure you that the gratitude of the colored people of this country towards you, who so eminently deserve it, is incalculable."

Ebenezer D. Bassett, a colored professor, afterwards Minister at Hayti, wrote from Philadelphia: —

"The speech, which I read in the *Herald*, is, it seems to me, unequalled by anything in the oratory of modern times, and I venture to predict that future ages will place it, as a work of art, side by side with the matchless *De Corona* of Demosthenes. It is certainly beyond all praise."

William Still, colored, and with the natural sentiments of his race, wrote from Philadelphia: —

"In my humble opinion, you have so effectually laid the axe at the root of the tree that thousands and tens of thousands who have been indifferent or Proslavery will henceforth work for the deliverance of the bondman, — will labor to help cut the tree down. Thus I am greatly encouraged, and devoutly hope and pray for a better day for my race soon."

Robert Purvis, an accomplished gentleman, connected by blood with the colored race, wrote from his home at Byberry, near Philadelphia: —

"Permit me, out of the fulness of my heart, to make to you my grateful acknowledgments for the most powerfully effective speech, in my humble opinion, against the 'Barbarism of Slavery,' ever made in this or any other country. Its *timeliness*, as well as its vital power, stirs within me the deepest emotions, which, indeed, are poorly expressed in subscribing myself as being your grateful and admiring friend and obedient servant."

H. O. Wagoner testifies to the sentiments of the colored people of Illinois, in a letter from Chicago: —

"For the great words you have spoken, and the ever-memorable services which you have just rendered in the Senate of the United States to the cause of my enslaved and down-trodden fellow-countrymen, I return you not only my own individual heartfelt thanks, but I venture to speak in the name and in the behalf of the seven or eight thousand colored people of the State of Illinois. . . . . Could the poor slave but know the substance of that speech, the circumstances under which it was given, in the very face of the Slave Power, — I say could the slaves be made to comprehend fully all this, it would thrill their very souls with emotions of joy unspeakable."

This collection, which might be extended, is concluded with a voice from the Land of Slavery. J. R. S. Van Vleet wrote from Richmond: —

"As a citizen of the 'Old Dominion,' and a hater of Slavery, I hereby send to you my unqualified approbation of your manly, bold, eloquent, and truthful exposition of the great crime of our common country; and let this come to you as from the slave-pens of Richmond, in the midst of which

these lines are secretly written, and within which hundreds of human hearts this moment feel the crushing weight of the 'Barbarism' you have so faithfully illustrated. If these poor slaves were permitted to give you thanks, their dark and gloomy prisons for once would be made vocal with praise, and their tears of sorrowing and bitterness be changed to tears of joy.

"If you knew the deep and secret interest which these people take in the great battle now waging, you would be stimulated in your efforts to hasten the day when we white men of Virginia could unite with the colored slave to celebrate our common emancipation. . . . .

"Some of the Northern Republicans affect to think that your speech was ill-timed; but I think it was just in time, and not a moment too soon. The Southern party demand that the area of Slavery shall be extended, — that the system shall be protected by Congressional legislation backed by the whole power of the Government; is it not, therefore, right and proper that the people of the Free States should know what that system is which they are required to perpetuate and protect? You have torn off its mask and exhibited to them its hideous features, and now let them say whether they will crush it beneath their feet, or foster, caress, and protect it."

William Rabé, Secretary of the Republican Central Committee of California, wrote from San Francisco : —

"We have republished your speech. . . . . I have the honor to hail from Mr. Chesnut's State, but am extremely sorry to be obliged to disagree with him, and to be obliged to indorse the reasoning of your speech, notwithstanding, or, in fact, in consequence of, my having been a planter in South Carolina for years. . . . . It may not be for me to eulogize you and your speeches; but that you have created an enthusiasm and opened the door for free talk on the subject of Slavery no one will deny, and the effect has already been electric."

From the press, and from correspondence, it is plain, that, whatever the efforts or desires of politicians, the question of Slavery had reached a crisis. Nothing touched the universal heart so strongly, and the interest extended abroad. For years the South had been growing passionate for this Barbarism, and determined on its extension. It now appeared that in the North there was a passion the other way. The Presidential election turned on Slavery, and nothing else. The precise point in issue was its limitation by preventing its spread into the Territories ; but this issue, even in its moderate form, involved the whole character of Slavery, and the supremacy of the Slave Power in the National Government.

The speeches during the canvass were on this issue. Politicians were swept into the irresistible current. This appeared in the pressure upon

Mr. Sumner to speak. At the close of the session of Congress, only a brief period after his exposure of the Barbarism of Slavery, on the invitation of the Young Men's Republican Union of New York, he delivered an address at Cooper Institute, on "The Origin, Necessity, and Permanence of the Republican Party," where he presented anew the argument against Slavery. This was followed by urgent requests to speak in other places. Hon. Hannibal Hamlin, the Republican candidate for Vice-President, wrote from Maine: "We want you much, very much. . . . . Will you come? Don't say, No." Hon. William P. Fessenden, learning that he was coming, wrote: "The news has rejoiced all our hearts." Hon. Neal Dow urged: "You may say *all* that is in your heart, relying *fully* upon the entire sympathy of the people." And John A. Andrew, who was visiting there, reported: "Your name will draw like a thousand elephants." There were other States where there was similar urgency. A private letter from Thurlow Weed, at Albany, hoping it would be in Mr. Sumner's power to visit New York, was followed by a formal letter from the New York State Republican Central Committee, pressing him to address the electors of this State, and saying: "The Committee are very urgent in this request, and hope you will consent to speak for us as much as possible"; and this was followed by a special appeal from Simeon Draper, Chairman of the State Committee. A similar call, with the same urgency, came from Illinois, — and here the agents were Hon. Elihu B. Washburne, of the Republican Congressional Committee at Washington, and Hon. N. B. Judd, Chairman of the Illinois Republican State Committee. In pressing the invitation, the latter said: "We can promise you such welcome as Western Republicans can give to laborers in the cause of Freedom"; and then again, in another letter: "The people expect you, and know that no personal motive or interest induces you to come, — only a deep conviction of the necessity for the election of Mr. Lincoln, and the triumph of the principles of which he is the representative." Another ardent Republican wrote from Chicago: "A glorious reception is awaiting you."

During the canvass, Mr. Sumner spoke several times in Massachusetts, treating different heads of the Great Question, as will appear in the course of this volume; but after his address at New York, he did not speak out of his own State. The appeals from other States attest that his method was not discarded by the people. As the Rebellion began to show itself, the Barbarism of Slavery was more and more recognized.

A VICTORY OF PRINCIPLE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT MIDDLEBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 11, 1860.

SENATE CHAMBER, June 11, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — It would give me pleasure to mingle with my fellow-citizens at Middleborough in pledges of earnest support to our candidates recently nominated at Chicago, but duties here will keep me away.

Be assured, however, of the sympathy, which I offer more freely because I find in the Platform declarations full of glorious promise. Our victory will be worth having, only as it is a victory of principle; but such a victory I expect.

Because I believe that our candidates hate the *five-headed* Barbarism of Slavery, and will set their faces against all its irrational and unconstitutional pretensions, I am earnest for their success.

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

F. M. VAUGHAN, Esq., Secretary, &c., &c.

REFUSAL TO COLORED PERSONS OF RIGHT OF PETITION.

NOTES OF UNDELIVERED SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON RESOLUTION REFUSING TO RECEIVE PETITION FROM CITIZENS OF MASSACHUSETTS OF AFRICAN DESCENT, JUNE 15, 1860.

JUNE 5, 1860, Mr. Sumner presented a petition of citizens of Massachusetts, of African descent, praying the Senate to suspend the labors of the Select Committee appointed to investigate the facts of the late invasion and seizure of public property at Harper's Ferry, and that all persons now in custody under the proceedings of such Committee be discharged, which was duly referred to the Select Committee.

June 15, Mr. Mason submitted a report from the Committee, accompanied by the following resolution: —

"*Resolved*, That the paper purporting to be a petition from 'citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, of African descent,' presented to the Senate by Charles Sumner, a Senator of Massachusetts, on the 5th of June, instant, and on his motion referred to a Select Committee of the Senate, be returned by the Secretary to the Senator who presented it."

This resolution was never called up for consideration, but it stands on the Journal of the Senate in perpetual testimony of the assumption of the Slave Power and its tyrannical hardihood. Anticipating its discussion, Mr. Sumner prepared the notes of a speech upon it, which are here preserved precisely as sketched at the time.

IT is difficult to treat this proposition, proceeding from a Committee of the Senate, except as you would treat a direct proposition of Atheism. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God"; but it was only in his heart; the fool in Scripture did not

openly declare it. Had he openly declared it, he would have been in a position hardly more offensive than your Committee.

There is a saying of antiquity, which has the confirming voice of all intervening time, that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." And now, Sir, while humbled for my country that such a proposition should be introduced into the Senate, I accept it as the omen of that madness which precedes the fall of its authors.

At this moment the number of free persons, African by descent, in the United States, is almost half a million, — being a population two thirds larger than the white population in South Carolina, more than one third larger than the white population in Mississippi, and six times larger than the white population in Florida. I mention these facts in order to show at the outset the number of persons whose rights are now assailed.

Already, in several States, free negroes are threatened with expulsion, under the terrible penalty of being sold into Slavery. The Supreme Court of the United States has stepped forward, and by cruel decree declared that they are not citizens, and therefore are not entitled to sue in the courts of the United States. And now, to complete their degradation and exclusion from all rights, it is proposed to declare that their petitions cannot be received by the Senate.

The right of petition is not *political*, but *personal*, — born with Humanity, and confirmed by Christianity, — belonging to all, but peculiar to the humble, the weak, and the oppressed. It belongs even to the criminal · for it is simply the right to pray.

There is no country, professing civilization, where this right is not sacred. In Mahometan countries it is revered. One of the most touching stories of the East is where a petitioner in affliction came before the Sultan, crying out, —

> "'My sorrow is my right,
> And I *will* see the Sultan, and to-night.'
> 'Sorrow,' said Mahmoud, 'is a reverend thing;
> I recognize its right, as king with king:
> Speak on.'"[1]

To take this right away from any portion of our *fellow-subjects* — even if you say they are not *fellow-citizens* — will be barbarous. And when I consider under what influence this proposition is brought forward, I present it as a fresh illustration of the Barbarism of Slavery, — most barbarous in the unconsciousness of its Barbarism.

The outrage is apparent from a simple statement.

In all the States — even in the Slave States — a free colored man may hold property of all kinds, personal or real, — even land, in which citizenship strikes its strongest root; but you will not allow him the poor right of petition.

He may own stocks of the United States, Treasury notes, and in other ways be the creditor of the Government; but you will not allow him the poor right of petition.

He is strictly bound by every enactment upon our statute-book; and yet you will not allow him to appear before you with a prayer to modify or soften this statute-book.

He is rigidly held to pay his quota of taxes; but you will not allow him to ask for their reduction.

[1] Leigh Hunt, Poems: Mahmoud.

And still further, under all your pension laws for Revolutionary services, and for services in other wars, whether on land or sea, he is entitled to a pension precisely as if he were white; but you will not allow him to solicit aid under these laws.

Such is a simple statement of the injustice you are about to do. On this statement alone, without one word of argument or illustration, you will surely recoil.

But this proposition proceeds on two assumptions, each of which is radically false: *first*, that a free person of African descent is not a citizen of the United States; and, *secondly*, that none other than a citizen is entitled to petition Congress.

In support of the first assumption is the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott. But against that decision — so unfortunate for the character of the tribunal from which it proceeded, — which has degraded that tribunal hardly less than it sought to degrade the African race — I oppose the actual fact in at least *six* of the original thirteen States at the adoption of the Constitution.

First, in Massachusetts, where the present petitioners reside, all persons, without distinction of color, are treated as citizens by its Constitution adopted in 1780.

Secondly, in Virginia, the State represented by the Senator [Mr. MASON] who brings forward this decree of disfranchisement, the same principle prevailed at the same time. And here I call attention to the 11th volume of Hening's Virginia Statutes, where, on page 322, may be found the law of October, 1783, which repeals that of 1779, limiting citizenship to whites, and enacts, "that *all free persons* born within the territory of this Commonwealth . . . . shall be deemed

citizens of this Commonwealth," without one word referring to descent or color.

Thirdly, in New Hampshire, whose Constitution conferred the elective franchise upon "every inhabitant of the State having the proper qualifications," — of which descent or color was not one.

Fourthly, in New York, where the Constitution conferred the elective franchise upon "every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided," &c., "if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder," &c., — without any discrimination of descent or color.

Fifthly, in New Jersey, by whose Constitution the elective franchise was conferred upon "*all inhabitants* of this colony, of full age, who are worth fifty pounds, proclamation money, clear estate," — also without any discrimination of descent or color.

Sixthly, in North Carolina, where Mr. Justice Gaston, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the State in the case of *The State* v. *Manuel*, declared that "the Constitution extended the elective franchise to *every freeman* who had arrived at the age of twenty-one and paid a public tax; and it is a matter of universal notoriety, that, under it, *free persons*, without regard to color, claimed and exercised the franchise, until it was taken from free men of color a few years since by our amended Constitution."[1]

To these authoritative precedents, drawn from the very epoch of the National Constitution, I might add other illustrations. I content myself with referring to the Constitution of Missouri, which, in speaking of "every free *white* male citizen,"[2] admits by implication

[1] 4 Devereux & Battle, 20.

[2] 1 Revised Statutes of Missouri, Art. III. Sec. 10.

that colored persons may be *citizens*, and to the Code of Alabama, which declares that certain sections "do not apply to or affect any free person of color who by the Treaty between the United States and Spain became *a citizen of the United States, or the descendants of such.*"[1]

But not only in six of the old thirteen States *all freemen* without distinction of color were *citizens*, but also under the Articles of Confederation they were *citizens*. By the fourth article it was expressly declared that "the *free inhabitants* of each of these States (paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted) shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of *free citizens* in the several States." The meaning of this clause, which is clear on its face, becomes clearer still, when it is known, that, while it was under discussion, on the 25th of June, 1778, the delegates from South Carolina moved to amend it by inserting between the words "free inhabitants" the word "white," so that the character of a citizen should be restricted to white persons. This proposition was rejected, — two States only voting for it, eight States against it, and the vote of one State being divided; so that the term "free inhabitants" was left in its full significance, without any distinction of descent or color.

The Constitution of the United States next followed. And it contains not a sentence, phrase, or word of disfranchisement on account of descent or color, any more than on account of religion.

If the present question depended upon citizenship, you could not refuse to receive the petition. But it does not depend upon citizenship. The right to pe-

[1] Code of Alabama, § 1037, p. 241.

tition Congress is not an incident of the elective franchise. It exists where the elective franchise does not exist. The Constitution expressly secures it, not simply to *citizens*, but broadly and completely to THE PEOPLE, declaring, in the first article of its Amendments, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, *or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.*"

The term *people* here naturally means all, without distinction of class, who owe allegiance to the Government. It is the American equivalent for *subjects.* If there were any doubt on this point, it would be removed by the clear and irresistible meaning of the term in other parts of the Constitution. Thus, in the clause constituting the House of Representatives, it is declared that it "shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the *people* of the several States, and the *electors* in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature." Here is an obvious difference between the "people" and "electors." The former is broader than the latter. It is the former that constitutes the *basis of representation*, and the Constitution then proceeds to declare that this basis "shall be determined by adding *to the whole number of free persons*, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other persons." Whatever may be the position of the *fractional* class, nothing can be clearer than that all *free persons*, without distinction of color or descent, be-

long to the *people*, and, so belonging, they are solemnly and expressly protected by the Constitution in the right of petition.

The Constitution next provides for the "enumeration" of the *people*, and under this provision there is a decennial census of the whole *people*, without distinction of color or descent; and yet, while including all of African descent in your population, you refuse to receive their petitions.

The present proposition is aggravated by well-attested facts in our history. A colored man, Crispus Attucks, was the first martyr of our Revolutionary struggle. Throughout the long war of seven years, while national independence was still doubtful, colored men fought sometimes in the same ranks with the whites, and sometimes in separate companies, but always with patriotic courage, and often under the eye of Washington. The blood of the two races mingled, and, dying on the same field, they were buried beneath the same sod. And this same association was continued throughout the War of 1812, in all our naval contests, and especially in the Battle of Lake Erie under Perry, and of Lake Champlain under Macdonough, where colored men performed a conspicuous part. But no better testimony can be presented than the eloquent proclamation of General Jackson, before the Battle of New Orleans, where he calls upon the "free colored inhabitants of Louisiana" to take part in the contest as *American soldiers*, and speaks of them by implication as "fellow-citizens."[1] "American soldiers" and "fellow-citizens": such is the language of Andrew Jackson, when speaking of those whom you would despoil of a venerable right.

[1] Niles's Weekly Register, Vol. VII. p. 205, December 3, 1814.

Thus, Sir, throughout our history, you have used these men for defence of the country, you have coined their blood into your own liberties; but you deny them now the smallest liberty of all, — the last which is left to the miserable, — *the liberty to pray.* In the history of misfortune or of tyranny nothing can surpass this final act of robbery. The words of the classic poet are fulfilled: —

> "'The wretch, in short, had nothing.' You say true:
> And yet the wretch *must lose that nothing too.*" [1]

There is a story of General Washington which illustrates by contrast the wrong of the present proposition. On a certain occasion, being engaged late at the quarters of his aid, Colonel Pickering, of Massachusetts, he proposed to pass the night, if the colored servant, Primus Hall, whom I remember at Boston in my childhood, could find straw and a blanket. Of course they were found; but it was by the surrender of the servant's own blanket. In the course of the night, the General, becoming aware of the sacrifice, most authoritatively required the servant to share the blanket, saying, "There is room for both, and I insist upon it"; and on the same straw, beneath the same blanket, the General and the faithful African slept till morning sun.[2] You not only refuse to share your liberties with the colored man, but you now propose to take from him his last blanket.

This is not the time to dwell on the character of the colored race; for the right of petition can never depend on the character of the petitioner, while in criminal

[1] Juvenal, Sat. III., 208, 209.

[2] Anecdotes of Washington, by Rev. Henry F. Harrington: Godey's Lady's Book, June, 1849.

cases liberty and life even may. But I mention two facts which speak for this much injured people. The first, Sir, is the official census, by which it appears that throughout the Free States among the colored population a much larger proportion attend school than among the whites of the Slave States, and this contrast becomes still more apparent when we consider the small attendance upon school by the whites in South Carolina. The other fact appears in the last will and testament of Mr. Upshur, of Virginia, Secretary of State under President Tyler, where he thus speaks: —

"I emancipate and set free my servant, David Rich, and direct my executors to give him one hundred dollars. I recommend him in the strongest manner to the respect, esteem, and confidence of any community in which he may happen to live. He has been my slave for twenty-four years, during which time he has been trusted to every extent and in every respect. My confidence in him has been unbounded; his relation to myself and family has always been such as to afford him daily opportunities to deceive and injure us, and yet he has never been detected in a serious fault, nor even in an intentional breach of the decorums of his station. His intelligence is of a high order, his integrity above all suspicion, and his sense of right and propriety always correct and even delicate and refined. I feel that he is justly entitled to carry this certificate from me into the new relations which he now must form. It is due to his long and most faithful services, and to the sincere and steady friendship which I bear him. In the uninterrupted and confidential intercourse of twenty-four years, I have never given nor had occasion to give him an unpleasant word. I know no man who has fewer faults or more excellencies than he. A. P. Upshur." [1]

[1] Nell, Services of Colored Americans in the Wars of 1776 and 1812, pp. 23, 24.

I do not dwell on precedents; for Senators willing to entertain this proposition can have little regard for any precedents in favor of Human Rights. I content myself with saying, that never before has this assault on Human Rights been made, — that petitions from colored persons have been often presented and refused, precisely as other petitions. Here, for example, is an instance on the Journals of the Senate: —

"Mr. Seward presented a petition of citizens of Ontario County, New York, praying that the army may be disbanded, and its services hereafter dispensed with; *a petition of male and female colored inhabitants of Boston, Massachusetts*, praying that colored men may be employed in transporting the mails, and enrolled in the militia; *and a petition of male and female colored inhabitants of Boston, Massachusetts*, protesting against the enactment of a law for the recovery of fugitive slaves."[1]

But I have said enough. Most earnestly and sincerely do I protest against this attempt, on three grounds: *first*, because, being essentially barbarous in character, it must be utterly shameful to a government boasting Christianity and professing Civilization; *secondly*, because it is a flagrant violation of the constitutional rights of more than half a million of American people; and, *thirdly*, because, in the present case, it is an insult to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, where these petitioners reside in the free enjoyment of all the rights of citizens, — among others, of voting for Members of Congress. I am unwilling to weaken this argument for Human Rights by any appeal to State Rights; but I cannot fail to observe that this proposition, which tramples down State Rights in order to assail Human Rights,

[1] Senate Journal, 31st Cong. 1st Sess., p. 313, April 30, 1850.

proceeds from a Senator [Mr. MASON] who always avows himself the defender of State Rights.

For myself, Sir, my course is plain. Whatever may be the action of the Senate, I shall continue to present such petitions. And permit me to say, that I should be little worthy of the place I now hold, if, at any time hereafter, receiving such petitions, I hesitate in the discharge of this sacred duty.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN SCHWARTZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE RESOLUTIONS IN TRIBUTE TO HIM, JUNE 21, 1860.

MR. PRESIDENT, — Some men make themselves felt at once by their simple presence, and Mr. Schwartz was of this number. No person could set eyes on him without being moved to inquire who he was, or, if the occasion presented, to form his acquaintance. His look was that of goodness, and he acted in a way to confirm the charm of his appearance. Entering tardily into public life, he followed the prompting of duty, and not of ambition. At this call he severed friendships, personal and political, believing that principle was of higher worth than party or politician or President. Thus, when already reverend with age, he became a Representative in Congress.

His presence in the other House was a protest. All who saw him there knew that he came from a constituency which had always been represented by an unhesitating member of the Democratic party, while he openly denounced that party,[1] and associated himself cordially and completely with those who, founding themselves on the Declaration of Independence and the

[1] Mr. Schwartz was of Berks County, and had been a Democrat all his life, until he felt constrained on the Lecompton Question to take ground against his old party.

Constitution, sought to bring the National Government to the ancient ways. I mention this circumstance, because it is an essential part of his too brief public life, while it illustrates his character, and proclaims his title to honor. The powerful party leader, "with a Senate at his heels," is less worthy of love and consideration than the simple citizen, who, scorning party ties, dares to be true and just.

But never did man, who had broken down a party at home, and taken his seat as representative of Opposition, wear his signal success more gently. Though decided and firm in conduct, he was winning and sweet in manner, and by beautiful example showed how to unite two qualities which are not always found together. Winter was not sterner, summer was not softer.

In character he did honor to the brave and pure German stock, which, even from that early day when first revealed to history in the sharp and clean-cut style of Tacitus, has preserved its original peculiarities untouched by change, showing, that, though the individual is mortal, the race is immortal. American by birth, and American in a generous patriotism, he was German in his clear blue eye, in his physical frame, in the warmth of his affections, and in the simplicity of his life. To him alone our tribute is now due; but, in pronouncing the name of JOHN SCHWARTZ, we cannot forget the "fatherland" of his ancestors, which out of its abundance has given to our Republic so many good heads, so many strong arms, with so much of virtue and intelligence, rejoicing in freedom, and calling no man master.

UNHESITATING ASSERTION OF OUR PRINCIPLES.

LETTER TO THE REPUBLICANS OF NEW YORK CITY,
JUNE 27, 1860.

AN enthusiastic meeting of the Old Men's and Young Men's Republican Central Committees of the City of New York was held on the evening of June 28, for the purpose of extending a welcome to the Republican Senators of the Eastern States, on their return from Congress. D. D. Conover, of the Old Men's Committee, presided, assisted by Charles S. Spencer, of the Young Men's Committee. The following letter from Mr. Sumner, in answer to an invitation, was read by Edgar Ketchum.

SENATE CHAMBER, June 27, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — I must renounce the opportunity of meeting the Republicans of New York tomorrow evening, asking them to accept my thanks for the invitation with which they have honored me.

Let me congratulate them on the good omens which cheer us on every side.

It only remains, that, by *unhesitating assertion of our principles,* we continue to deserve victory.

Believe me, my dear Sir,
Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

EDGAR KETCHUM, Esq.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY:

ITS ORIGIN, NECESSITY, AND PERMANENCE.

SPEECH BEFORE THE YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION OF NEW YORK, AT COOPER INSTITUTE, JULY 11, 1860.

THIS early speech in the Presidential campaign which ended in the election of Abraham Lincoln was made by Mr. Sumner while on his way home from Washington. It was reported and noticed by the New York press. A journal having little sympathy with it describes the magnificence and enthusiasm of the auditory, and thus abridges the speech in flaming capitals: "The Presidential Contest; Great Convulsion in the Republican Camp; Charles Sumner on the Stump; A Strong Plea for Old Abe; Another Attack upon Slaveholders; The Fivefold Wrong of Human Slavery."

The meeting is mentioned in all the journals as one of the largest ever assembled within the walls of Cooper Institute, and also remarkable for respectability of appearance. One of them says it seemed more like an audience of some great concert or festival than a political meeting. As soon as the doors were opened every available position was occupied, and in half an hour afterwards it was impossible to find accommodation. More than one third of the vast hall had been reserved for ladies, and it was completely filled. The windows of the upper floor opening upon the basement were crammed with people. On the stage were many distinguished persons, judges and ex-judges. The welcome of the speaker is thus noticed by another: —

"Mr. Sumner appeared on the rostrum precisely at eight o'clock, and was received with an outburst of excited enthusiasm which defies all description. The applause was unanimous and intense. Cheer after cheer arose, loud and vociferous; men stood up and waved their handkerchiefs and their hats till scarcely anything else could be seen."

The scene at this time was chronicled by the *Independent*.

"The orator's return to the people, after his long and enforced retirement from the platform, was celebrated at Cooper Institute with such a welcome

as we have rarely seen given to any man. On coming forward, he was greeted with cheer after cheer, the audience rising and prolonging their salutations through many minutes, with continuous shouting and waving of handkerchiefs."

Mr. Rogers, the President of the Young Men's Republican Union, nominated for chairman of the meeting Hon. Abijah Mann, Jr., which nomination was unanimously accepted. Mr. Mann, on taking the chair, said that they had now to listen to the voice of one who had stood up manfully for freedom of speech, not only against open foes, but even against the opposition of some of his colleagues. [*Applause.*] He was here to-night to maintain this same right to free speech, and to express his views of the political condition of the country. It gave him pleasure to introduce to the audience Hon. Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Sumner, on taking the stand, was again greeted with loud and prolonged cheers. After tendering acknowledgments for the generous and cordial reception, and regretting his inability to express all he felt, he proceeded with his speech, which was thus described by the *Evening Post:* —

"Mr. Sumner was as happy in the manner as he was forcible in the matter of his speech. His commanding person, his distinct utterance, and his graceful elocution combined with the eloquence of his words in keeping the immense auditory to their seats for two hours, without a movement, and almost without a breath, save when the applause broke forth. It is the first time that Mr. Sumner has spoken in public since he was laid low in the Senate House, and New York, by this grand demonstration, has shown its eagerness to welcome him to the field of so many former triumphs."

In this speech Mr. Sumner sought to popularize his argument in the Senate on the Barbarism of Slavery, with an application to the Presidential election, and at the same time to reassert the positions he had there taken. Its influence was increased by the circulation it enjoyed. Besides the *Tribune*, *Times*, *Herald*, and *World*, which printed it in full, there was a pamphlet edition of more than fifty thousand copies circulated by the Young Men's Republican Union. The Secretary of the Republican Central Committee of California wrote, that this Committee, after publishing a large edition of the "Barbarism of Slavery," published ten thousand copies of the New York speech, which was "read with that attention which the subject elucidated by you readily commands." Among letters with regard to it, two are preserved as friendly voices.

Hon. W. H. Seward wrote from Auburn: —

"Your speech, in every part, is noble and great. Even you never spoke so well."

Another friend, who had not agreed with Mr. Sumner at an earlier period, George Livermore, the intelligent merchant of Boston, devoted to books as well as business, being in New York at the time, heard the speech, and, in a letter dated at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, wrote : —

"I can say in all sincerity, that, of all the political addresses I have ever heard, — and for thirty years past I have heard a great many, and from the most distinguished men in the country, — I have never listened to one that would begin to compare with this as a whole. The high and broad ground on which you based your views, the clearness and force with which you presented the subject, the dignity and grace of your manner, and the honest and hearty tone in which you uttered your thoughts, all together make your speech *the best one that was ever delivered*, as far as my knowledge and experience go."

These testimonies will at least explain the effect of this speech at the time.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW YORK : —

OF all men in our history, there are two whose influence at this moment is peculiar. Though dead, they yet live, speak, and act in the conflict of principle which divides the country, — standing face to face, like two well-matched champions. When I add that one was from South Carolina and the other from Massachusetts, you cannot fail to see that I mean John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams.

Statesmen, both, of long career, marked ability, and unblemished integrity, — acting together at first, — sitting in the same Cabinet, from which they passed, one to become Vice-President, and the other President, — then, for the remainder of their days, battling in Congress, and dying there, — each was a leader in life, but each is now in death a greater leader still.

Mr. Calhoun possessed an intellect of much originality and boldness, and, though wanting the culture of a scholar, made himself felt in council and in debate. To native powers unlike, but not inferior, Mr. Adams

added the well-ripened fruits of long experience in foreign lands and of studies more various and complete than those of any other public man in our history, besides an indomitable will, and that spirit of freedom which inspired his father, when, in the Continental Congress, he so eloquently maintained the Declaration of Independence, making himself its Colossus on that floor.

Sitting together in the Cabinet of Mr. Monroe, they concurred in sanctioning the Missouri Prohibition of Slavery as constitutional, and so advised the President. But here divergence probably began, though for a long time not made manifest. The diary of Mr. Adams shows that at that early day, when Slavery had been little discussed, he saw its enormity with instinctive quickness, and described it with corresponding force. The record is less full with regard to Mr. Calhoun; but when they reappeared, one in the Senate, and the other in the House of Representatives, each openly assumed the position by which he will be known in history, — one as chief in all the pretensions of Slavery and Slave-Masters, the other as champion of Freedom.

Mr. Calhoun regarded Slavery as a permanent institution; Mr. Adams regarded it as something transitory. Mr. Calhoun vaunted it as a form of civilization; Mr. Adams scorned it as an unquestionable barbarism. Mr. Calhoun did not hesitate to call it the most stable basis of free government; Mr. Adams vehemently denounced it as a curse, full of weakness and mockery, doubly offensive in a boastful Republic. Mr. Calhoun, not content with exalting Slavery, proceeded to condemn the early opinions of Washington and Jefferson as "folly and delusion," to assail the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence as "absurd," and then to

proclaim that human beings are "property" under the Constitution, and, as such, may be transported into the Territories and there held in Slavery; while Mr. Adams added to the glory of his long and diversified career by persistent efforts which are better for his fame than having been President, — upholding the great rights of petition and of speech, — vindicating the early opinions of the Fathers, and the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, — exposing the odious character of Slavery, — insisting upon its prohibition in the Territories, — denying the asserted property in man, — and especially, and often, exhibiting the unjust power in the National Government usurped by what he called "the little cluster" of Slave-Masters, whose yoke was to him intolerable.

Such, most briefly told, were antagonist opinions of these two chiefs. Never was great conflict destined to involve a great country more distinctly foreshadowed. All that the Republican party now opposes may be found in John C. Calhoun; all that the Republican party now maintains may be found in John Quincy Adams. Choose ye, fellow-citizens, between the two.

The rule of "Principles and not Men" is hardly applicable to a man whose name, bearing the sacred seal of death, has become the synonym of Principle; yet I do not hesitate to say that our cause is best appreciated in its precise objects and aims. Proud as we are to tread where John Quincy Adams leads the way, there is a guide of more commanding authority — found in the eternal law of Right, and the concurring mandate of the Constitution itself, when properly interpreted — that teaches the duties of a good citizen. Such is the guide of the Republican party, which, I say fearlessly,

where most known, will be most trusted, and, when understood in its origin, will be seen to be no accidental or fugitive organization, merely for an election, but an irresistible necessity, which in the nature of things must be permanent as the pretensions, moral and political, which it seeks to constrain and counteract.

All must admit, too, that, if no Republican party existed now, — even if that halcyon day had come, so often promised by cajoling politicians, when the Slavery Question was settled, — still there would be a political necessity for a great party of Opposition to act as check on the Administration. A kindred necessity was once expressed by an eminent British statesman, who gave as a toast, "A strong Administration and a strong Opposition." Parties are unknown in despotic countries. They belong to the machinery of free governments. Through parties public opinion is concentrated and directed; through parties principles are maintained above men; and through parties men in power are held to a just responsibility. If ever there was occasion for such a party, it is now, when the corruptions of the Administration are dragged to light by Committees of Congress. On this ground alone good men might be summoned to rescue the government of our country.

It is an attested fact that Mr. Buchanan became President through corruption. Money, familiarly known as a "corruption fund," first distilled in small drippings from clerks and petty officials, was swollen by larger contributions of merchants and contractors, and with this accumulation votes were purchased in Philadelphia, enough to turn the election in that great metropolis, and in the chain of cause and effect to assure

the triumph of the Democratic candidate. I speak now only what is proved. Fraudulent naturalization papers in blank, by which this was perpetrated, were produced before a Committee of Congress. It was natural that an Administration thus corrupt in origin should continue to exercise power through the same corruption by which power was gained; but nothing else than that insensibility to acts of shame produced by familiarity can explain how all this has been done with such absolute indecency of exposure, so as to recall the words of the poet, —

"How use doth breed a habit in a man!"

A letter from a local politician, addressed to the President himself, urging without disguise the giving of a large contract for machinery to a particular house in Philadelphia, employing four hundred and fifty mechanics, with a view to the approaching election, was sent to the Secretary of the Navy, with this indorsement, in a well-known handwriting, signed by well-known initials: "Sept. 15, 1858. The enclosed letter from Colonel Patterson, of Philadelphia, is submitted to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy. J. B." Thus did the President of the United States, in formal written words, now of record in the history of the country, recommend the employment of the public money, set apart for the public service, to influence an election. Here was criminality as positive as when his supporters purchased votes in the streets. From one learn all; and from such a characteristic instance learn the character of the Administration. But there are other well-known instances; and the testimony before the Congressional Committees discloses the President on Sundays in secret conclave with one of his corrupt agents, piously

occupied discussing the chances of an election, and how its expenses were to be met, while, at the same time, like another Joseph Surface, he was uttering in public "fine sentiments" of political morality, and lamenting the prevalence of the very indecencies in which he was engaged.

It was natural that a President, who, with professions of purity on the lips, made himself the pander of such vulgar corruption, should stick at nothing needful to carry his purposes. I shall not dwell on the Lecompton Constitution; but it belongs to this chapter. You all know its wickedness. Concocted originally at Washington, with the single purpose of fastening Slavery upon the people of Kansas, it was by execrable contrivance so arranged as to prevent the people, when about to become a State, from voting on that question. Next sanctioned by a convention of usurpers, who in no respect represented the people of Kansas, then fraudulently submitted to the people for their votes, it was fraudulently adopted by stuffing ballot-boxes on a scale never before known. Thus, at the Delaware Crossing, where there were but forty-three legal voters, four hundred were returned; at Oxford, where there were but forty-two legal voters, a thousand were returned; and at Shawnee, where there were but forty legal voters, twelve hundred were returned. And yet this Constitution, disowned by the very Governor who had gone to Kansas as agent of the President, — rotten with corruption, gaping with falsehood, and steaming with iniquity, — was at once recognized by the President, urged upon Congress in a special message, and pressed for adoption by all the appliances of unprincipled power. If the words of Jugurtha, turning his back

upon Rome, cannot be repeated, that the Republic is for sale, and soon to perish, if it shall find a purchaser,[1] nor the sharper saying of Walpole, that every man has his price, it was not from any forbearance in the President. A single editor was offered the printing of Post-Office blanks worth at least eighty thousand dollars, if by an article no larger than a man's hand he would show submission to the Administration. Bribes of office were added to bribes of money. As the votes of electors had been purchased to make Mr. Buchanan President, the votes of Representatives were now solicited to carry out his scheme of corruption, and the Halls of Congress were changed into a political market-house, where men were bought by the head. Is not all this enough to arouse the indignation of the people?

It is true that the President, whose power began in corruption, and who is responsible author of the corruption by which his administration has been debased, is no longer a candidate for office. Already judgment begins. His own political party discards him. The first avenging blow is struck. Incorruptible history will do the rest. The tablet conspicuously erected in Genoa to expose the crimes of certain Doges, branding one as *Fur Magnus* and another as *Maximus Latronum*, will not be needed here. The exposed corrupter, the tyrant enslaver, and the robber of Human Freedom cannot be forgotten. Unhappy President! after a long career of public service, not only tossed aside, but tossed over to perpetual memory as an example to be shunned! Better for him the oblivion of common life than the bad fame he has won!

[1] "Urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emtorem invenerit." — Sallust, Jugurtha, c. 35.

But, though not himself a candidate for office, his peculiar supporters, animated by his spirit, linked with him in misrule, are embodied as a party, and ask your votes. Simply to resist this combination, and to save the Republic from its degrading influence, would justify the formation of the Republican party; and I doubt not that there are many who will be content to unite with us on this ground alone, anxious to put the National Government once again in pure hands. To all such, welcome!

While this consummation necessarily enters into the present purposes of the Republican party, while we naturally begin by insisting upon purity in the Government, and make this one of our urgent demands, it is obvious that the quickening impulse of the party is to be found in other purposes, which cannot pass away in a single election. The Republican party seeks to overthrow the Slave Oligarchy in the National Government, and especially at this moment to stay its aggressions in the Territories, which, through a corrupt interpretation of the Constitution, it threatens to barbarize with Slavery. But all who seek purity in the National Government must unite in this purpose; for only by the overthrow of this base Oligarchy, which, beginning in the denial of all human rights, necessarily shows itself in barbarism and villany of all kinds, can a better order prevail. It is out of Slavery that all our griefs proceed; nor can the offences of the present Administration be fully comprehended without considering the nature of this Evil, and its chronic influence over our Government, reaching everywhere by subtle agencies, or more subtle, far-reaching example, but still in itself the original and all-sufficient activity. As well attempt to

explain the Gulf Stream without the Gulf of Mexico, or the Origin of Evil without the human heart, as attempt to explain the present degraded character of the National Government without Slavery. As well attempt the play of "Othello" without the Moor. And permit me to say that our warfare with these iniquities will be feeble, unless we attack them in their origin.

At the beginning of our history Slavery was universally admitted to be an Evil. Nobody then so hardy as to vindicate it. In the Convention which framed the Constitution it was branded as "a nefarious institution," or more mildly called "wrong"; and these generous voices came from the South as well as from the North. Out of the Convention there was a similar accord. I shall not quote the words of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, or Jay, for they are familiar to all. Even as they spoke others spoke, and I might occupy the whole evening simply reciting this testimony. Nor were these declarations confined to public life. The Colleges all, by definite action, arrayed themselves against Slavery, especially the University of William and Mary, in Virginia, which conferred upon Granville Sharp, the acknowledged chief of British Abolitionists, the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. The Literature of the land, such as it was, agreed with the Colleges. The Church, too, added its powerful voice; and here, amid diversities of religious faith, we hail that unity of spirit which animated all. Quakers, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists seemed to vie with each other in this pious testimony.

The Constitution was adopted, but the word Slave

was not allowed to pollute its text; and this was in declared deference to the prevailing opinion, which regarded Slavery as temporary, destined soon to pass away. All looked to the glad day as almost at hand. In harmony with this expectation, Slavery was prohibited in all existing territories of the Union, so that, when Washington, as first President of the United States, at his inauguration here in New York took his first oath to support the Constitution, the flag of the Republic nowhere on the land within the jurisdiction of Congress covered a single slave. Little then did the Fathers dream that the Evil which they regarded with shame and exerted themselves to prohibit would elevate its obscene crest as it now does, and flaunt its monstrous pretensions before the world. Little did they dream that the Constitution, from which they had carefully excluded the very *word*, would be held, in defiance of reason and common sense, to protect the *thing*, so exceptionally that it could not be reached by Congressional prohibition, even within Congressional jurisdiction. Little did they dream that the text, which they left so pure and healthful, would, through corrupt interpretation, be swollen into such an offensive Elephantiasis.

Two circumstances, civilizing in themselves, exercised an unexpected influence for American Slavery: first, the abolition of the slave-trade, which by taking away the supply increased the value of slaves; and, secondly, the increased cultivation of cotton, stimulated by the invention of new machinery. The latter has been of especial moment. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that out of this slender cotton fibre are formed the manacles of the slave. Thus, through sinister activity, and the

wickedness of men, is good made the minister of wrong. Next after Christopher Columbus, who by sublime enterprise opened a pathway to the New World, Eli Whitney, who discovered the cotton gin, has been indirectly and unconsciously a chief agent in the bondage of the African race on the North American continent; and surely proper gratitude for the advantages we enjoy in such large store from these two discoveries must prompt us to increased activity for the welfare of those who, alas! have been such losers, where we have been such gainers.

The change of opinion, so disastrous in result, was gradual. Though in its successive stages easily detected by the careful inquirer, it did not become manifest to the whole country till 1820, when it burst forth in the Missouri Question. Then, for the first time, Slavery showed itself openly violent, insolent, belligerent. Freedom was checked, but saved something by a compromise, — announced, at the moment of its adoption, by Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, as a triumph of the South, — where, in consideration of the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, thus securing additional preponderance to the Slave Power, it was stipulated that Slavery should be prohibited in certain outlying territory, at that time trodden only by savages. Then came a lull, during which the change was still at work, until, contemporaneously with the abolition of Slavery in the British West Indies, the discussion was lighted anew. Meanwhile slaves augmented in price, and slave-masters became more decided. In timid deference to the world, they at first ventured no defence of Slavery in the abstract; but at last, bolder grown under the lead of Mr. Calhoun, they threw aside all reserve, openly

assailed the opinions of the Fathers, audaciously denied the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, and by formal resolution asserted the new dogma of Slavery in the Territories. This was as late as 1847. A letter of that day, from Mr. Calhoun, addressed to a member of the Alabama Legislature, shows that there was an element of policy in this exaggeration. His desire was "to force the Slavery issue" on the North, believing that delay was dangerous, as the Slave-Masters were then relatively stronger, both morally and politically, than they would ever be again.

At last the end has come. Slavery is openly pronounced, at one time, the black marble keystone of our National Arch, — at another time, the corner-stone of our Republican edifice; then it is vaunted as the highest type of civilization, — then as a blessing to the master as well as the slave, — and then again as ennobling to the master, if not to the slave. It is only the first step which costs, and therefore the authors of these opinions, so shocking to the moral sense, do not hesitate at other opinions equally shocking to the reason, even to the extent of finding impossible sanctions for Slavery in the Constitution. Listening to these extravagances, who would not exclaim, with Ben Jonson in the play? —

> "Grave fathers, he 's possessed; again I say,
> Possessed: nay, if there be possession and
> Obsession, he has both." [1]

And now, fellow-citizens, what is Slavery? This is no question of curiosity or philanthropy merely; for when the National Government, which you and I at the North help to constitute, is degraded to be its in-

[1] The Fox, Act V. sc. 8.

strument, and all the National Territories are proclaimed open to its Barbarism, and the Constitution itself is perverted to its support, the whole subject naturally, logically, and necessarily enters into our discussion. It cannot be avoided; it cannot be blinked out of sight. Nay, you must pass upon it by your votes at the coming election. Futile is the plea that we at the North have nothing to do with Slavery. Granted that we have nothing to do with it in the States, we have much to do with all its irrational assumptions under the Constitution, and just so long as these are urged must Slavery be discussed. It must be laid bare in its enormity, precisely as though it were proposed to plant it here in the streets of New York. Nor can such a wrong — foul in itself, and fouler still in pretensions — be dealt with tamely. Tameness is surrender. And charity, too, may be misapplied. Forgiving those who trespass against us, I know not if we are called to forgive those who trespass against others, — to forgive those who trespass against the Republic, — to forgive those who trespass against Civilization, — to forgive those who trespass against a whole race, — to forgive those who trespass against the universal Human Family, — finally, to forgive those who trespass against God. Such trespassers exist among us, possessing the organization of party, holding the control of the National Government, constituting a colossal Power, and

> "what seems its head
> The likeness of a *President* has on."

Surely, if ever there was a moment when every faculty should be bent to the service, and all invigorated by an inspiring zeal, it is now, while the battle between Civilization and Barbarism is still undecided, and you

are summoned to resist the last desperate shock. To this work I am not equal; but I do not shrink from the duties of my post. Alas! human language is gentle, and the human voice is weak. Words only are mine, when I ought to command thunderbolts. Voice only is mine, when, like the ancient Athenian, I ought to carry the weapons of Zeus on the tongue. Nor would I transcend any just rule of moderation, or urge this warfare too far among persons. Humbly do I recognize the authority of Him, who, when reviled, reviled not again; but this divine example teaches me to expose crime, and not to hesitate, though the Scribes and Pharisees, chief-priests and money-changers, cry out. And it shows how words of invective may come from lips of peace. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." Thus spake the Saviour in Jerusalem; and he still speaks, not in Jerusalem only, but wherever men are won from truth, wherever crime exists to be exposed and denounced.

What, then, I repeat, is Slavery? The occasion forbids detail; but enough must be presented to place this outrage in its true light, — as something worse even than a constant state of war, where the master is constant aggressor. Here I put aside for the moment all the tales which reach us from the house of bondage, — all the cumulative, crushing testimony, from slaves and masters alike, — all the barbarous incidents which help to arouse a yet too feeble indignation, — in short, all the glimpses which come to us from this mighty Bluebeard's chamber. All these I put aside, not because they are of little moment in exhibiting the true char-

acter of Slavery, but because I desire to arraign Slavery on grounds above all controversy, impeachment, or suspicion, even from Slave-Masters themselves. Not on wonderful story, where the genius of woman has prevailed, not even on indisputable facts, do I now accuse Slavery, but on its character as revealed in its own simple definition of itself. Out of its own mouth do I condemn it.

By the *Law of Slavery*, man, created in the image of God, fearfully and wonderfully made, with sensibilities of pleasure and pain, with sentiments of love, with aspirations for improvement, with a sense of property, and with a soul like ourselves, is despoiled of his human character, and declared to be a mere *chattel*, "to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." I do not stop to give at length all its odious words; you are doubtless familiar with them. The heathen idea of Aristotle is repeated, — "a tool with a soul."[1] But in this simple definition is contained the whole incalculable wrong of Slavery; for out of it, as from an inexhaustible fountain, are derived all the unrighteous prerogatives of the master. These are five in number, and I know not which is most revolting.

First, there is the pretension that *man can hold property in man*, — forgetful, that, by a law older than all human law, foremost stands the indefeasible right of every man to himself.

Secondly, *the absolute nullification of the relation of husband and wife*, so that all who are called slaves are delivered over to concubinage or prostitution, it may be with each other, or it may be with their masters; but with whomsoever it may be, it is the same, for with

[1] Politics, Book I. ch. 4.

slaves marriage is impossible, as they are merely "coupled," never married.

Thirdly, *the utter rejection of the relation of parent and child;* for the infant legally belongs, not to the mother who bore it, but to the master who bought it.

Fourthly, *the complete denial of instruction;* for the master may always, at his own rude discretion, prevent his victim from learning to read, and thus shut against him those gates of knowledge which open such vistas on earth and in heaven.

Fifthly, *the wholesale robbery of the labor of another, and of all its fruits,* — forgetful, that, by the same original law under which every man has a title to himself, he has also a title to the fruits of his own labor, amounting in itself to a sacred property, which no person, howsoever called, whether despot or master, can righteously appropriate.

Such are the five essential elements of Slavery. Look at them, and you will confess that this institution stands forth as a hateful assemblage of unquestionable wrongs under sanction of existing law. Take away any one of these, and just to that extent Slavery ceases to exist. Take away all, and the Slavery Question will be settled. But this assemblage becomes more hateful still, when its unmistakable *single motive* is detected, which is simply *to compel labor without wages.* Incredible as it may be, it cannot be denied that the right of a man to himself, the right of a husband to his wife, the right of a parent to his child, the right of a man to instruction, the right of a man to the fruits of his own labor, all these supreme rights, by the side of which other rights seem petty, are trampled down in order to organize that *five-headed* selfish-

ness, practically maintained by the lash, which, look at it as you will, has for its single object COMPULSORY LABOR WITHOUT WAGES.

Obviously and unquestionably the good of all is against such a system; nor, except for the pretended property of the master, and his selfish interest, could there be any color for it. That Slavery thus constituted can be good for the master is one of the hallucinations of the system, — something like the hallucination of the opium-eater. Fascinating, possibly, it may be for a time, but debasing and destructive it must be in the end. "I agree with Mr. Boswell," said Dr. Johnson, "that there must be high satisfaction in being a feudal lord"; but the moralist did not consider this a good reason for such a power at the expense of others.[1] That Slave-Masters should be violent and tyrannical, that they should be regardless of all rights, especially where Slavery is concerned, and that the higher virtues of character should fail in them, — all this might be inferred, even in the absence of evidence, according to irresistible law of cause and effect. No man can do injustice with impunity. He may not suffer in worldly condition, but he must suffer in his own nature. And the very unconsciousness in which he lives aggravates the unhappy influence. Nor can familiarity with Slavery fail to harden the heart.

Persons become accustomed to scenes of brutality, till they witness them with indifference. Hogarth, that master of human nature, portrayed this tendency in his picture of a dissection at a medical college, where the president maintains the dignity of insensibility over a

[1] Boswell, Life of Johnson, April 6, 1772, ed. Croker (London, 1835,) Vol. III. p. 212.

corpse, which he regards simply as the subject of a lecture. And Horace Walpole, who admired the satire of this picture, finds in it illustration of the idea, that "the legal habitude of viewing shocking scenes hardens the human mind, and renders it unfeeling."[1] This simple truth, in its most general application, exhibits the condition of the Slave-Master. How can he show sensibility for the common rights of fellow-citizens who sacrifices daily the most sacred rights of others merely to secure *labor without wages?* With him a false standard is necessarily established, bringing with it a blunted moral sense and clouded perceptions, so that, when he does something intrinsically barbarous or mean, he does not blush at the recital.

Here, again, I forbear all detail. The reason of the intellect blending with the reason of the heart, the testimony of history fortified by the testimony of good men, an array of unerring figures linked with an array of unerring facts, — these all I might employ. And I might proceed to show how this barbarous influence, beginning on the plantation, diffuses itself throughout society, enters into official conduct, and even mounts into Congress, where for a long time it has exercised a vulgar domination, trampling not only on all the amenities of debate, but absolutely on Parliamentary Law. I shall not open this chapter.

There is one frightful circumstance, unhappily of frequent occurrence, which proclaims so clearly the character of the social system bred by Slavery, that I shall be pardoned for adducing it. I refer to the roasting of slaves alive at the stake. One was roasted very recently, — not after public trial, according to the forms

[1] Anecdotes of Painting in England: *Hogarth*, p. 723.

of law, as at the fires of Smithfield, but by a lawless crowd, suddenly assembled, who in this way made themselves ministers of a cruel vengeance. This Barbarism, which seems to have become part of the customary Law of Slavery, may well cover us all with humiliation, when we reflect that it is already renounced by the copper-colored savages of our continent, while during the present century more instances of it have occurred among our Slave-Masters than we know among the former since that early day when Captain Smith was saved from sacrifice by the tenderness of Pocahontas. Perhaps no other usage reveals with such fearful distinctness the deep-seated, pervading influence of Slavery, offensive to Civilization, hostile to Law itself, by virtue of which it pretends to live, insulting to humanity, shocking to decency, and utterly heedless of all rights, forms, or observances, in the maintenance of its wicked power. Here I add, that the proportion of slave to free is not without influence in determining treatment. Fear is a constant tyrant, with an inhumanity which does not tire or sleep, and nothing can quicken its cruelty more than the dread of vengeance for the multitudinous wrong done to the slave.

I would not be unjust to Slave-Masters. Some there are, I doubt not, of happy natures, uncorrupted by the possession of tyrannical power, who render the condition of their slaves endurable, and in private virtues emulate the graces of Civilization; but the good in these cases comes from the masters, *notwithstanding* Slavery. And, besides, there are the great examples of the Fathers, who, looking down upon Slavery and regarding it as an Evil, were saved from its contamination. To all these I render heartfelt homage. But their

exceptional virtues cannot save the essential wrong which I expose. Nor am I blinded by the blandishments of that wealth which is the fruit of Slavery. With abhorrence we read of the scandalous man-traffic by which a Hessian prince of Germany sold his subjects to be used by George the Third against our fathers; and we share the contempt expressed by Frederick, surnamed the Great, when he levied on these victims, passing through his dominions, the customary toll for so many head of cattle, since, as he said, they had been sold as such; and even now the traveller turns with disgust from the pleasant slopes of the ducal garden which was adorned by these unholy gains.[1] But all this, and more, must be renewed in our minds, when we think of American Slavery, with the houses and gardens decorated by its sweat.

Such, fellow-citizens, is Slavery, as manifest in its law, and also in its influence on society. Bad as it is, if it modestly kept at home, if it did not stalk into the National jurisdiction and enter into the National Government, *within reach of our votes,* I should not summon you on this occasion to unite against it; for, whatever the promptings of sympathy and of godlike philanthropy, nothing is clearer than that our political duties depend simply upon our political responsibilities; and since we are not politically responsible for Slavery in Charleston, or in Constantinople, so in neither place have we any political duties in regard to it. Lament it, wherever it exists, we must, and surround its victims with our prayers; but our action, while in-

[1] Here was the prison of the Emperor Louis Napoleon, after his defeat and surrender at Sedan, September 1, 1870.

spired by these sentiments, must rest within the bounds of Law and Constitution.

Here the field is ample. Indeed, if Slavery existed nowhere within the national jurisdiction, our duty would still be urgent to grapple with that pernicious influence, which, through an *Oligarchical Combination* of Slave-Masters, unknown to the Constitution, never anticipated by its founders, and in defiance of their example, has entered into and possessed the National Government, like an Evil Spirit. This influence, which, wielding at will all the powers of the National Government, even those of the Judiciary, has become formidable to Freedom everywhere, clutching violently at the Territories, and menacing the Free States, — as witness the claim, still undecided in the court of the last resort, so audaciously presented by a citizen of Virginia, to hold slaves in New York on the way to Texas; this influence, now so vaulting, was for a long time unobserved, even while exercising a controlling power. At first timid and shy, from undoubted sense of guilt, it avoided discussion, yet was determined in its policy. The Southern Senator who boasted that for sixty years the Slave States had governed the country knew well their constant inferiority to the Free States in population, wealth, manufactures, commerce, schools, churches, libraries, and all the activities of a true Civilization, — knew well that they had contributed nothing to the literature of the country, even in Political Economy and the science of Government, which they have so vehemently professed, except the now forgotten "forty bale theory,"[1] — knew well that by no principle

[1] This was the special thunder of Mr. McDuffie in the debates on the Tariff during the administration of General Jackson.

of justice could this long predominance be explained; but he forgot to confess the secret agency. Though unseen, Slavery was present always with decisive influence. No matter what the question, it was the same. Once the Free States inclined to Free Trade, but the Slave States went the other way; but when the former inclined towards Protection, the Slave Power in the dark behind dictated Free Trade, and so it has been till now. Here is the subtle ruling influence, against which population, wealth, manufactures, commerce, schools, churches, libraries, and all the activities of a true Civilization are impotent. The Slave Power is always master, and it is this Power which for sixty years, according to the boast of the Senator, has governed this broad and growing country, doing what it pleases, and penetrating far-away places, while it sacrifices all who will not do its bidding.

The actual number of slaveholders was for a long time unknown, and on this account was naturally exaggerated. It was often represented very great. On one occasion, a distinguished representative from Massachusetts, whose name will be ever cherished for devotion to Human Rights, — I mean the late Horace Mann, — was rudely interrupted on the floor of Congress by a member from Alabama, who averred that the number of slaveholders was as many as three millions.[1] At

[1] "Mr. Mann. . . . . I have seen the number of *actual slaveholders* variously estimated; but the highest estimate I have ever seen is three hundred thousand. . . . .

"Mr. Gayle, of Alabama, interrupted, and said: If the gentleman from Massachusetts has been informed that the number of slaveholders is only three hundred thousand, then I will tell him his information is utterly false.

"Mr. Mann. Will the gentleman tell me how many there are?

"Mr. Gayle. Ten times as many."

Cong. Globe, 30th Cong. 1st Sess., App., p. 835, June 30, 1848.

that time there was no official document by which this extravagance could be corrected. But at last we have it. The late census, taken in 1850, shows that the whole number of this peculiar class, all told, so unfortunate as to hold slaves, was only 347,525;[1] and of this number the larger part are small slaveholders, leaving only 92,000 persons as owners of the great mass of slaves, and substantial representatives of this class. And yet this small Oligarchy, odious in origin, without any foundation in that justice which is the essential base of every civilized association, stuck together only by confederacy in all the *five-headed* wrong of Slavery, and constituting in itself what in other days was called *Magnum Latrocinium*, has, by confession of one of its own leaders, for sixty years governed the Republic. To this end two things have concurred: first, its associated wealth, being the asserted value of its human flesh, constituting a flagitious capital of near two thousand millions of dollars; and, secondly, its peculiar representation in the House of Representatives, where, under the three-fifths rule of the Constitution, ninety members actually hold their seats by virtue in part of this in-

[1] Distributed according to the following table: —

Holders of a single slave					68,820
" "	1	and under	5		105,683
" "	5	" "	10		80,765
" "	10	" "	20		54,595
" "	20	" "	50		29,733
" "	50	" "	100		6,196
" "	100	" "	200		1,479
" "	200	" "	300		187
" "	300	" "	500		56
" "	500	" "	1000		9
" "	1000	and over			2
Total					347,525

De Bow's *Compendium of the Seventh Census*, p. 95.

defensible property. Thus are our Slave-Masters an enormous Corporation, or Joint-Stock Company, by the side of which the United States Bank, with its petty thirty millions of capital, and without any peculiar representation, is dwarfed into insignificance.

All tyranny, like murder, is foul at the best; but this is most foul, strange, and unnatural, especially when it is considered that the States occupied by the Slave Oligarchy are far below the Free States in resources of all kinds. By the last census there was in the Free States a solid population of freemen amounting to upwards of thirteen millions, while in the Slave States there was a like population of only six millions. In other respects, important to Civilization, the disparity was as great, — all of which I have amply shown elsewhere. And yet from the beginning this Oligarchy has taken the lion's share among the honors and trusts of the Republic, while it entered into and possessed both the old political parties, Whig and Democrat, — as witness their servile resolutions always, — making them one in subserviency, though double in form, and renewing in them the mystery of the Siamese twins, which, though separate in body and different in name, are constrained by an unnatural ligament to a community of exertion.

I feel humbled, when I dwell on the amazing disproportion of offices usurped by this Oligarchy. From the beginning, all the great posts of the Republic — Presidency, Vice-Presidency, seats in the Cabinet, seats in the Supreme Court, Presidency of the Senate, Speakership — seem to be almost perpetually in their hands. At this moment, the Free States, with double the population of the Slave States, have only four out of nine

Justices of the Supreme Court; and of these four, it must be said, three are Northern men with Southern principles. And in the humbler places at the Departments the same extraordinary disproportion prevails. Out of the whole number there employed, 787 are from the Slave States and District of Columbia, and 441 from the Free States, but mostly with Southern principles. These instances are typical. There is nothing in the National Government which the Oligarchy does not appropriate. Down to our day it has held the keys of every office, from President to the humblest postmaster, compelling all to do its bidding. It makes Cabinets, — organizes Courts, — directs the Army and Navy, — manages every department of public business, — presides over the Census, — conducts the Smithsonian Institution, founded by the generous charity of a foreigner to promote the interests of mankind, — and subsidizes the national press, alike in the national capital and in the remotest village of the North.

Mounting the marble steps of the Capitol, it takes the chair of the President of the Senate, also the chair of the Speaker of the House, then arranges the Committees of both bodies, placing at their head only servitors of Slavery, and excluding friends of Freedom, though entitled to such places by personal character and the States they represent; and thus it controls the national legislation. From the Capitol to the most distant confines, the whole country is enslaved. The Mahometan priest turns in prayer towards Mecca, his pulpit is on the side which fronts towards Mecca, his auditors face towards Mecca. But Slavery is our Mecca, towards which everything turns, everything fronts, everything faces.

In maintaining its power the Slave Oligarchy applies a test for office very different from that of Jefferson: "Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?" These things are all forgotten now in the single question, signalizing the great change which has taken place, "Is he faithful to Slavery?" With arrogant ostracism, it excludes from every national office all who cannot respond to this test, thus surrounding and blockading every avenue of power. So complete and offensive has this tyranny become, that at this moment, while I am speaking, could Washington, or Jefferson, or Franklin, or John Jay, once more descend from his sphere above, to mingle in our affairs, and bless us with his wisdom, not one of them, with his recorded, *unretracted* opinions on Slavery, could receive a nomination for the Presidency from either fraction of the divided Democratic party, or from that other political combination known as the Union party, — nor, stranger still, could either of these sainted patriots, whose names alone open a perpetual fountain of gratitude in all your hearts, be confirmed by the Senate of the United States for any political function whatever, not even for the local office of Postmaster. What I now say, amid your natural astonishment, I have said often in addressing the people, and more than once from my seat in the Senate, and no man there has made answer, for no man who has sat in its secret sessions, and observed the test practically applied, could make answer; and I ask you to accept this statement as my testimony, derived from the experience which is my lot. Yes, fellow-citizens, had this test prevailed in the earlier days, Washington, "first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," could

not have been created Generalissimo of the American forces, Jefferson could not have taken his place on the Committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, and Franklin could not have gone forth to France, with the commission of the infant Republic, to secure the invaluable alliance of that ancient kingdom, — nor could John Jay, as first Chief Justice, have lent to our judiciary the benignant grace of his name and character.

Standing on the bent necks of an enslaved race, with four millions of human beings as the black marble Caryatides to support its power, the Slave Oligarchy erects itself into a lordly caste which brooks no opposition. But when I speak of Caste, I mean nothing truly polite; and when I speak of Oligarchy, I mean nothing truly aristocratic. As despotism is simply an abuse of monarchy, so Oligarchy is simply an abuse of aristocracy, unless it be that most vulgar of all, "aristocracy of the skin." Derived from Slavery, and having the interests of Slavery always in mind, our Oligarchy must naturally take its character from this *five-headed* wrong.

"Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill."

All that is bad in Slavery, its audacity, its immorality, its cruelty, its robbery, its meanness, its ignorance, its barbarous disregard of human rights, and its barbarous disregard of every obligation, must all be reproduced in its representative. If the Oligarchy hesitates at nothing to serve its selfish ends, it simply acts in harmony with Slavery, from which it draws its life-blood. If in grasp of power it is like the hunchback Richard, if in falsehood it copies Iago, and if in character it is low as the brutish Caliban,

> "Which any print of goodness will not take,
> Being capable of all ill," —

ay, if in all these respects it surpasses its various prototypes, — if in steady baseness, in uniform brutality, and consummate wickedness it is without a peer, be not astonished, fellow-citizens, for it acts simply according to the original law of its birth and the inborn necessities of its being. With all these unprecedented qualities and aptitudes combined into one intense activity, it goes where it will and does what it pleases. The Pterodactyl of an early geological period, formed for all service and every element, with neck of bird, mouth of reptile, wing of bat, body of mammifer, and with hugest eye, so that it could seek its prey in the night, — such was the ancient and extinct kindred of this Oligarchy, which, like Milton's fiend,

> "O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense, or rare,
> With head, hands, wings, or feet pursues his way,
> And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies."

The soul sickens in contemplating the acts of dishonest tyranny perpetrated by this lordly power. I cannot give their prolonged history now. But looking at the old Missouri Compromise, founded on the admission of Missouri as a Slave State, and in consideration thereof the Prohibition of Slavery in other outlying territory, and seeing how, after an acquiescence of thirty-four years, and the irreclaimable possession by Slavery of its especial share in the provisions of this Compromise, in violation of every obligation of honor, compact, and good neighborhood, and in contemptuous disregard of the outgushing sentiments of an aroused North, this time-honored Prohibition was overturned, and the vast region now known as Kansas and Nebraska

opened to Slavery, — looking next at the juggling bill by which this was accomplished, declaring that its object was to leave the people "perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," and seeing how, in spite of these express words, the courageous settlers there were left a prey to invading hordes from Missouri, who, entering the Territory, organized a Usurpation which by positive law proceeded to fasten Slavery upon that beautiful soil, and to surround it with a code of death, so strict, that the famous bell which once swung in the steeple over the Hall of Independence at Philadelphia would be nothing but a nuisance in Kansas, while its immortal inscription, "Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," would be an offence, and the sexton who rang the bell a criminal, — looking at the Lecompton Constitution, that masterpiece of wicked contrivance, by which this same people, in organizing a State, were fraudulently prevented from passing upon the question of Slavery, and seeing how the infamous counterfeit, though repudiated by the people, was openly adopted by the President, and by him corruptly urged upon Congress, with all the power of his Administration, — looking at these things, so recent and menacing, I feel how vain it is to expect truce or compromise with the Slave Oligarchy. Punic in faith, as in fear, no compact can bind it, while all interpretations of the Constitution friendly to Freedom, though sanctioned by Court and Congress in continuous precedent, are unceremoniously rejected. Faust, in the profound poem of Goethe, on being told that in Hell itself the laws prevail, says : —

> "Now that I like: so, then, one may, in fact,
> Conclude a binding compact with you, gentry!"

To which Mephistopheles replies: —

> "Whatever promise in our books finds entry
> We strictly carry into act."

But no compact or promise binds our gentry, although entered again and again in their books.

According to a famous saying, Russia is a "despotism tempered by assassination"; but even the steel of Brutus, refulgent in the Capitol, without the supplementary fulfilment of the wish of Caligula, that all should have a single life, must fail to reach our despotism, which in numbers enjoys an immunity beyond any solitary tyrant. Surely, if the Oligarchy is to live yet longer, its badges should symbolize its peculiar despotism born of Slavery. The coin, seal, and flag must be changed. Let the eagle be removed, giving place to the foul vulture with vulgar beak and filthy claw, — how unlike that bird of Jove, with ample pinion, and those mighty pounces, holding the dread thunderbolt and better olive of peace! — and instead of these, let there be fetter and lash, borrowed from the plantation, which is the miniature of the broader plantation to which the Republic is reduced. That appearance may be according to reality, and that we may not seem what we are not, this at least must be done. Abandon, too, the stars and stripes, — the stars numbering the present Union, the stripes numbering that Union which gave to mankind the Declaration of Independence with immortal truth; and let these also be replaced by the universal fetter and lash, for here is typified our Oligarchy, in all present power, as in all vital principle. Fetter and lash! The schoolboy shall grow up honoring the chosen emblems; the citizen shall hail them with sympathetic pride; the Republic shall be known

by them on coin, seal, and flag; while the ruler of the subjugated land, no longer President, shall be called Overseer.

Of course, fellow-citizens, you are now ready to see that the corruptions by which the present Administration is degraded are the natural offspring of slaveholding immorality. They have all concurred in sustaining the policy of the Oligarchy, and in the case of the Lecompton Constitution in direct effort to fasten Slavery upon a distant Territory, and they are all marked by the effrontery of Slavery. There is also its vulgarity; but this is natural; for is not pretension a fruitful source of vulgarity? and, pray, what is Slavery, but an enormous Pretension? Smollett attributes the peculiar profligacy of England at a particular period to the demoralization of the South Sea Bubble; but what is such a fugitive influence, compared with Slavery, which, indeed, if it were not a crime, might well be called a Bubble? A Government which vindicates the sale of human beings need not hesitate to purchase votes, whether at the polls or in Congress. The two transactions belong to the same family, though unquestionably the last is the least reprehensible.

Fellow-citizens, — And now we are brought to the practical bearing of this statement. Beyond all doubt your souls rise in judgment against these things. Beyond all doubt you are saddened at the shadow which they cast over the land. Beyond all doubt you are unwilling to bear any responsibility for their longer continuance. But this is not enough. There must be opposition, active, constant, perpetual; and this is the

foremost duty of patriotism. From the virtuous Reformer, Wycliffe, whose name illumines the earlier period of English history, we learn that men are sharers in evil deeds who from "coward dumbness" fail to oppose them. There can be no such coward dumbness now. Happily, a political party is at hand whose purpose is to combine and direct all generous energies for the salvation of the country.

Would you arrest these terrible corruptions, and the disastrous influence from which they spring, involving nothing less than civilization on this continent, the Republican party tells you how, and, in telling you how, vindicates at once its Origin and its Necessity. The work must be done, and there is no other organization by which it can be done. A party with such an origin and such a necessity cannot be for a day, or for this election only. It cannot be less permanent than the hostile influence which it is formed to counteract. Therefore, just so long as the present false theories of Slavery prevail, whether concerning its character, morally, economically, and socially, or concerning its prerogatives under the Constitution, and just so long as the Slave Oligarchy, which is the sleepless and unhesitating agent of Slavery in all its pretensions, continues to exist as a political power, the Republican party must endure. If bad men conspire for Slavery, good men must combine for Freedom; nor can the Holy War be ended, until the Barbarism now dominant in the Republic is overthrown, and the Pagan power is driven from our Jerusalem. And when this triumph is won, securing the immediate object of our organization, the Republican party will not die, but, purified by long contest with Slavery, and filled with higher

life, it will be lifted to yet other efforts for the good of man.

At present the work is plain before us. It is simply to elect our candidates: Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, whose ability, so conspicuously shown in his own State, attracted at once the admiration of the whole country, whose character no breath has touched, and whose heart is large enough to embrace the broad Republic and all its people, — him you will elect President; and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, whose clear head, firm principles, and ample experience none who sit with him in the Senate Chamber can contest, — him you will elect Vice-President. Electing these, we shall put the National Government, at least in its Executive department, openly and actively on the side of Freedom; and this alone will be of incalculable influence, not only in itself, but as harbinger of the Future.

First and foremost, we shall save the Territories from the five-headed Barbarism of Slavery, keeping them in their normal condition, as they came from the hand of God, free, — with Freedom written on the soil and engraved on the rock, while the winds whisper it in the trees, the rivers murmur it in their flow, and all Nature echoes it in joy unspeakable.

Next, we shall save the country and the age from that crying infamy, the Slave-Trade, whose opening anew, as now menaced, is but a logical consequence of the new theories of Slavery. If Slavery be the "blessing" it is vaunted, then must the Slave-Trade be beneficent, while they who ply it with fiercest activity take place among the missionaries and saints of humanity.

Next, we shall save the Constitution, at least within the sphere of Executive influence, from outrage and

perversion; so that the President will no longer lend himself to that wildest pretension of the Slave Oligarchy, as Mr. Buchanan has done, declaring that Slavery is carried under the Constitution into all the Territories, and that it now exists in Kansas as firmly as in South Carolina. As out of nothing can come nothing, so out of the nothing in the Constitution on this subject can be derived no support for this inordinate pretension, which may be best dismissed in that classical similitude by which the ancients rebuked a groundless folly, when they called it *ass's wool*, or something that does not exist, and plainly said to its author, *Asini lanas quæris*, — "You are in quest of ass's wool!"[1]

Next, we shall help save the Declaration of Independence, now dishonored and disowned in its essential, life-giving truth, — *the Equality of Men.* This transcendent principle, which appears twice at the Creation, first, when God said, "Let us make man in our image," and, secondly, in the Unity of the Race, then divinely established, — which appears again in the New Testament, when it was said, "God, that made the world and all things therein, hath made of one blood all nations of men," — which appears again in the primal reason of the world, anterior to all institutions and laws, — belongs to those self-evident truths, sometimes called axioms, which no man can question without exposing to question his own intelligence or honesty. As well deny arithmetically that two and two make four, or deny geometrically that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, as deny the axiomatic, self-evident, beaming truth, that all men are equal. As of the sun in the heavens, blind is he who cannot

[1] Erasmus, Adagia, Chil. I. Centur. IV. Prov. 79.

perceive it. Of course, this principle, uttered in a Declaration of Rights, is applicable simply to rights; and it is a childish sophism to allege against it the obvious inequalities of form, character, and faculties. As axiom, it admits no exception; for it is the essence of an axiom, whether in geometry or in morals, to be universal. As abstract truth, it is also without exception, according to the essence of such truth. And, finally, as self-evident truth, so announced in the Declaration, it is without exception; for only such truth can be self-evident. Thus, whether axiom, abstract truth, or self-evident truth, it is always universal. In vindicating this principle, the Republican party have a grateful duty, to which they are moved by justice to a much-injured race, excluded from its protection, and by justice also to the Fathers, whose well-chosen words, fit foundation for empire, are turned into mockery. Nor can the madness of the Propagandists be better illustrated than in this assault on the Declaration of Independence, stultifying the Fathers for no other purpose than to clear the way for their five-headed abomination of *Compulsory Labor without Wages.*

And, finally, we shall help expel the Slave Oligarchy from all its seats of National power, driving it back within the States. This alone is worthy of every effort; for, until this is done, nothing else can be completely done. In vain you seek economy or purity in the National Government, in vain you seek improvement of rivers and harbors, in vain you seek homesteads on the public lands for actual settlers, in vain you seek reform in administration, in vain you seek dignity and peace in our foreign relations, with just sympathy for struggling Freedom everywhere, while

this selfish and corrupt power holds the National purse and the National sword. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the door will be open to all generous principles. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the wickedness of the Fugitive Slave Bill will be expelled from the statute-book. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and Slavery will cease at once in the National Capital. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the Slave-Trade will no longer skulk along our coasts beneath the National flag. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and Liberty will become, in fact, as in law, the normal condition of all the National Territories. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the National Government will be at length divorced from Slavery. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the National star will be changed from Slavery to Freedom. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the North will be no longer the vassal of the South. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and the North will be admitted to its just share in the trusts and honors of the Republic. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy, and a mighty victory of Peace will be won, whose influence on the Future of our country and of mankind no imagination can paint.

Prostrated, exposed, and permanently expelled from ill-gotten power, the Oligarchy will cease to exist as a political combination. Its final doom may be postponed, but it is certain. Languishing, it may live yet longer; but it will surely die. Yes, fellow-citizens, surely it will die, when, disappointed in purpose, driven back within the States, and constrained within these limits, it can no longer rule the Republic as a plantation of slaves at home, can no longer menace the Territories with five-headed device to compel *Labor without Wages*, can no longer fasten upon the Constitution an

interpretation which makes merchandise of men and gives disgraceful immunity to brokers of human souls and butchers of human hearts, and can no longer grind flesh and blood, with groans and sighs, tears of mothers and cries of children, into the cement of a barbarous political power. Surely, then, in its retreat, smarting under the indignation of an aroused people and the concurring judgment of the civilized world, it must die, — it may be as a poisoned rat dies of rage in its hole.

Meanwhile all good omens are ours. The work cannot stop. Quickened by the triumph now so near, with a Republican President in power, State after State, quitting the condition of a Territory and spurning Slavery, will be welcomed into our Plural Unit, and, joining hands together, will become a belt of fire girt about the Slave States, within which Slavery must die, — or, happier still, joining hands together, they will become to the Slave States a zone of Freedom, radiant, like the ancient cestus of Beauty, with transforming power.

It only remains that we speed these good influences. Others may dwell on the Past as secure; but to my mind, under the laws of a beneficent God, *the Future also is secure,* — on the single condition that we press forward in the work with heart and soul, forgetting self, turning from all temptations of the hour, and, intent only on the cause,

> "With mean complacence ne'er betray our trust,
> Nor be so civil as to prove unjust." [1]

[1] Pope, Essay on Criticism, 580, 581.

OUR CANDIDATES WILL BE ELECTED.

LETTER TO THE LINCOLN AND HAMLIN CLUB OF OWEGO, NEW YORK, JULY 30, 1860.

BOSTON, July 30, 1860.

DEAR SIR, — It is still uncertain whether my engagements here and elsewhere will allow me to visit Tioga County during the present season. But I beg to assure the Republicans there of my sympathy in their generous labors.

There is ample reward simply in working for a good cause; but we have before us, also, the assurance that our candidates will be elected.

Accept my thanks for the honor of your invitation, and believe me, dear Sir,

With much respect,
Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

ISAAC S. CATLIN, Esq.

EMANCIPATION IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES A BLESSING, AND NOT A FAILURE.

LETTER TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS, JULY 30, 1860.

BOSTON, July 30, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR, — If I forego the opportunity which you offer me of uniting with the earnest Abolitionists of Massachusetts in celebrating the anniversary of Emancipation in the British Islands of the West Indies, I pray you not to believe me insensible to the magnanimous teachings of that day, — destined, I doubt not, as men advance in virtue, to take its place yet more and more among the great days of History.

Nothing shows the desperate mendacity of the partisans of Slavery more than the unfounded persistence with which they call this act "a failure." If it be a failure, then is virtue a failure, then is justice a failure, then is humanity a failure, then is God himself a failure; for virtue, justice, humanity, and God himself are all represented in this act.

Well-proved facts vindicate completely the policy of Emancipation, even if it were not commanded by the simplest rules of morality. All testimony, whether from official documents or from travellers, shows, beyond question, that in these islands the condition of the negro is improved by emancipation; but this testimony

is especially instructive, when we learn that the improvement is most strongly manifest in those who have been born in Freedom. Ask any person familiar with these islands, — as I have often done, — or consult any unprejudiced authority, and such will be the answer. This alone is enough to vindicate the act. Moreover, it is enough, if *men* are raised in the scale of being, even though sugar perishes from the earth.

But careful statistics attest that the material interests of these possessions share the improvement of the population. In some of the islands, as in Barbadoes and Antigua, the advance is conspicuous, while in Jamaica itself, which is the instance most constantly cited of "failure," the evidence is unanswerable, that the derangement of affairs cannot be charged upon Emancipation, but is a natural incident to the anomalous condition of that island throughout its history, aggravated by insane pretensions of the Slave-Masters. Two different Governors of this island[1] have assured me, that, with all their experience there, they looked upon Emancipation as a "blessing." Thus is it shown that the true policy of this world is found in justice. Nothing is truer than that injustice, beside its essential wickedness, is folly also. The unjust man is a fool.

Only recently important testimony on this subject has found place, where it would be hardly expected, in the columns of the "New York Times"; and similar testimony occurs in other quarters, both in England and America. And yet, with the truth flashing in their faces, our Slave-Masters misrepresent the sublime and beautiful act as a "failure"! This, however, is of a piece with their whole conduct.

[1] The Earl of Elgin and Sir Charles Grey.

Let me thank you for the invitation with which you have honored me, and for the good wishes with which you cheer me; and believe me, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

SLAVERY A BARBAROUS DISEASE TO BE STAYED.

LETTER TO A REPUBLICAN MEETING AT THE DEDICATION OF THE REPUBLICAN WIGWAM IN NEW YORK, AUGUST 6, 1860.

BOSTON, August 6, 1860.

GENTLEMEN, — Accept my thanks for the invitation with which you have honored me. Knowing by recent experience something of the generous Republicans of New York, it is with reluctance that I renounce the opportunity you give me of mingling with them on an interesting occasion.

As citizens of a great metropolis, they have duties of peculiar difficulty. It is in these centres that the Pro-slavery sentiment of the North shows itself with violence often kindred to that of the plantation, so as almost to justify the language of Jefferson, who called great cities "sores" of the body politic.[1] Even this expression does not seem too strong, when we recognize the infection of Slavery breaking out sometimes in the violence of mobs, and constantly manifest in the press, in public speech, and in a corrupt public sentiment. It belongs to the Republican party, by gentle, healing influences, guided by a firm hand, to inaugurate the

[1] "The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government as sores do to the strength of the human body." — *Notes on Virginia*, Query XIX.: Writings, Vol. VIII. p. 406.

work of *cure*, that health may be substituted for disease.

Meanwhile the wretched disease must be understood, and I venture to call attention to a work just published in New York, where it is exposed with consummate ability: I refer to "Slavery in History," by Adam Gurowski. The learned author, who vindicates his new title as American citizen by noble effort for the good of his adopted country, exhibits Slavery, from the beginning of time, in all nations and places, as nothing more nor less than a monstrosity, disturbing, corrupting, and debasing the government under which it exists, and all the individuals who are parties to it, directly or indirectly: for no man can sustain Slavery, or in any way apologize for it, without suffering in moral, if not also in intellectual nature. Such a work, founded on careful studies, and executed in the spirit of science, will naturally take a place in libraries; but I am sure that all inquirers into the character of Slavery, and especially all practical Republicans, engaged in efforts to stay the spread of this barbarous disease, ought to welcome it as an ally. No good citizen who makes himself acquainted with Slavery can hesitate to join against it.

Accept my best wishes for the success of your festival, and also the assurance of the respect with which

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obliged Servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

HOMER FRANKLIN, ABRAHAM W. KENNEDY, W. K. SCHENCK, Esqrs.

TRIBUTE TO A COLLEGE CLASSMATE.

REMARKS ON THE LATE JOHN W. BROWNE, AUGUST 20, 1860.

MR. BROWNE died suddenly, May 1st, 1860. A little volume was printed in the summer, entitled "In Memoriam J. W. B.," to which Mr. Sumner contributed the following notice. Prefixed were the words of Fénelon: —

"Il n'y a que les grands cœurs qui sachent combien il y a de gloire à être bon."

I SHOULD feel unhappy, if this little book of tribute to my early friend were allowed to appear without a word from me. We were classmates in college, and for two out of the four years of undergraduate life were chums. We were also together in the Law School. Perhaps no person now alive knew him better, during all this period. Separated afterwards by the occupations of the world, I saw him only at intervals, though our friendship continued unbroken to the end, and when we met, it was always with the warmth and confidence of our youthful relations.

Of all my classmates, I think that he gave, in college, the largest promise of future eminence, mingled, however, with uncertainty whether the waywardness of genius might not betray him. None then imagined that the fiery nature, nursed upon the study of Byron, and delighting always to talk of his poetry and life, would be tamed to the modest ways which he afterwards adopted. The danger seemed to be, that, like his

prototype, he would break loose from social life, and follow the bent of lawless ambition, or at least plunge with passion into the strifes of the world. His earnestness at this time bordered on violence, and in all his opinions he was a partisan. But he was already thinker as well as reader, and expressed himself with accuracy and sententious force. Voice harmonizes with character, and his was too apt to be ungentle and loud.

They who have known him only latterly will be surprised at this glimpse of him in early life. A change so complete in sentiment, manner, and voice, as took place in him, I have never known. It seemed like one of those instances in Christian story, where the man of violence is softened suddenly into a saintly character. I do not exaggerate in the least. So much have I been impressed by it at times, that I could hardly believe in his personal identity, and I have recalled the good Fra Cristoforo, in the exquisite romance of Manzoni, to prove that the simplest life of unostentatious goodness may succeed a youth hot with passion of all kinds.

To me, who knew him so well in his other moods, it was touching in the extreme to note this change. Listening to his voice, now so gentle and low, while he conversed on the duties of life, and with perfect simplicity revealed his own abnegation of worldly aims, I have been filled with reverence. At these times his conversation was peculiar and instructive. He had thought for himself, and expressed what he said with all his native force refined by new-born sweetness of soul, which would have commended sentiments even of less intrinsic interest. I saw how, in the purity of his nature, he turned aside from riches and from ambition of all kinds, content with a tranquil existence,

undisturbed by any of those temptations which promised once to exercise such sway over him. But his opinions, while uttered with modesty, were marked by the hardihood of an original thinker, showing that in him

> "the Gods had joined
> The mildest manners and the bravest mind."

His firm renunciation of office, opening the way to a tempting political career, when formally tendered to him, is almost unique. He had been Representative from Lynn, in the Legislature of Massachusetts, and was nominated as Senator for Essex. This was long ago, in 1838, while he was yet a young man; and here his sagacity seemed to be remarkable as his principles. At that early day, when the two old political parties had been little criticised, he announced that their strife was "occasional and temporary, and that both had forgotten or overlooked the great principle of equal liberty for all, upon which a free government must rest as its only true and safe basis." He then proceeded to dissolve his connection with parties, in words worthy of perpetual memory. "I disconnect myself from party," he said, "whose iron grasp holds hard even upon the least of us, and mean in my little sphere, as a private individual, to serve what seems to me the cause of the country and humanity. I cannot place currency above liberty. I cannot place money above man. I cannot fight heartily for the Whigs and against their opponents, when I feel, that, whichever shall be the victorious party, the claims of humanity will be forgotten in the triumph, and that the rights of the slave may be crushed beneath the advancing hosts of the victors."[1]

[1] Letter to the Whig County Committee of the County of Essex, November 5, 1838: In Memoriam J. W. B., pp. 9, 10.

No better words have been uttered in our political history. In this spirit, and with his unquestionable abilities, he might well have acted an important part in the growing conflict with Slavery. But his love of retreat grew also, and he shrank completely from all the activities of political life. There was nothing that was not within his reach; but he could not be tempted.

I cannot disguise that at times I was disposed to criticise this withdrawal, as suggesting too closely the questionable philosophy concentrated in the saying, *Bene vixit qui bene latuit.* But as often as I came within the sphere of his influence, and felt the simple beauty of his life, while I saw how his soul, like the sensitive leaf, closed at the touch of the world, I was willing to believe that he had chosen wisely for himself, or at all events that his course was founded on a system deliberately adopted, upon which even an old friend must not intrude. Having always the greatest confidence in his resources, intellectual as well as moral, I was never without hope that in some way he would make his mark upon his country and his age. If he has not done this, he has at least left an example precious to all who knew him.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE ISSUES.

SPEECH AT THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AT WORCESTER, AUGUST 29, 1860.

THIS Convention was organized by the choice of the following officers : —

President, — George S. Boutwell of Groton.

Vice-Presidents, — At large, — Alfred Macy of Nantucket, Robert T. Davis of Fall River, Ezra W. Taft of Dedham, George Morey of Boston, Samuel Hooper of Boston, Charles W. Upham of Salem, P. J. Stone of Charlestown, B. C. Sargent of Lowell, Ebenezer Torrey of Fitchburg, Joel Hayden of Williamsburg, W. B. C. Pearsons of Holyoke ; Suffolk, — Charles Torrey of Boston ; Essex,— Henry K. Oliver of Lawrence ; Middlesex, — Charles Hudson of Lexington ; Worcester, — P. Emory Aldrich of Worcester ; Norfolk, — James Ritchie of Roxbury ; Bristol, — Samuel O. Dunbar of Taunton ; Hampden, — E. B. Gillette of Westfield ; Hampshire, — William Hyde of Ware ; Franklin, — William B. Washburn of Greenfield ; Berkshire, — Walter Laflin of Pittsfield ; Plymouth, — Levi Reed of Abington ; Barnstable, — James Gifford of Provincetown ; Nantucket, — Edward Field of Nantucket ; Dukes, — John Vinson of Edgartown.

Secretaries, — George W. McLellan of Cambridge, Andrew Tower of Malden, Philip Cook of Provincetown, A. B. Underwood of Newton, W. C. Sheldon of Ware, W. W. Clapp, Jr., of Boston, Charles H. Spring of Holyoke, Franklin Williams of Roxbury, J. J. Piper of Fitchburg, Edmund Anthony of New Bedford, Thomas G. Kent of Milford, Edwin B. George of Groveland, W. S. George of Adams, J. A. Alden of East Bridgewater, S. S. Eastman of Greenfield, W. A. Brabiner of Brighton.

At this Convention John A. Andrew was for the first time nominated as Governor.

The Convention had more than its annual importance, as it was on the eve of a Presidential election. Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, were the Republican candidates for Presi-

dent and Vice-President; John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and Joseph Lane, of Oregon, the Democratic candidates; Stephen H. Douglas, of Illinois, and Herschell V. Johnson, of Georgia, the candidates of a seceding body of Democrats, known as the Douglas party; John Bell, of Tennessee, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, candidates of old Whigs, called at the time the Bell-Everett party.

On motion of J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester, afterwards Representative in Congress, Mr. Sumner was invited to address the Convention. The report says: —

"Mr. Sumner then came forward, and his appearance upon the platform was hailed with enthusiastic shouts, which testified the esteem and admiration in which the distinguished Senator is held by his fellow-Republicans of the Commonwealth. The cheering was continued some minutes, and when it had subsided, Mr. Sumner proceeded to address the crowded assembly, — the vast hall being filled to overflowing."

MR. PRESIDENT, — It is now six years since I had the honor of meeting my Republican fellow-citizens of Massachusetts in State Convention, drawn together from all parts of our beloved Commonwealth, — and then also, I remember well, it was at this good city of Worcester. Returning, at last, with restored health, to the activities of public life, I am happy again in this opportunity. It is pleasant to look into the faces of friends, and to feel the sympathy of kindred hearts.

Nor can I disguise the satisfaction which I find at being here in Worcester, — early and constant home of the Republican cause. When other places, even in Massachusetts, were indifferent for Freedom, Worcester was earnest; and when the cause was defeated in other counties, here, under the lead of an eminent citizen, now the ornament of the bench,[1] it triumphed by brilliant majorities; so that Worcester became known, not only throughout Massachusetts, but everywhere, through-

[1] Hon. Charles Allen.

out the country, as our impregnable stronghold. Long since, while America was yet an unsettled wilderness, an English poet depicted a county of our motherland as

"That shire which we *the heart of England* well may call";[1]

and this ancient verse furnishes a descriptive phrase which has been aptly applied to our Worcester, "the heart," as it is the central county, of the Commonwealth. But though truly belonging to Worcester on this account, I have always been glad to believe that it only justly depicted her as the "heart" of our cause, — here at least in Massachusetts.

If this cause were of common political interest, if it turned only on some question of mere policy, or if it involved simply the honors and emoluments of office, I should willingly leave the contest to others. It would have little attraction for me But it is far above these things. It concerns the permanent well-being, primarily, of all the outlying territories of the Republic, broad enough for empires, now menaced by Slavery; and since one part of the body cannot suffer without all being affected, it concerns the permanent well-being and also the good name of the whole country, clouded by the growing influence of Slavery. Nor is this all. The special motive for the proposed extension of Slavery is to fortify the Slave Power in the Senate of the United States, and, through the assured preponderance of this Power there, to control the National Government in legislation, diplomacy, and the distribution of office, so that, in short, no law can be passed, no treaty

[1] Drayton, Poly-Olbion, Song XIII. Warwickshire, the middle county of England, is the shire referred to.

can be ratified, and no individual, though possessing all possible fitness for public service, can be confirmed for office of any kind, without the consent of the Slave Power, — thus, through the Senate, controlling the Judiciary itself. Seeking, therefore, by active measures, — I say active and immediate measures, — to save the Territories, you seek also to save the whole country, not only from a deadly influence, but also from a degrading rule, which ostracizes from office all who avow the early opinions of the Fathers.

Such is our cause, nakedly stated, without illustration or argument. Strange that it is not recognized at once by every patriot heart! Strange that we should be compelled to vindicate it, sometimes against open foes, and sometimes — harder still — against others who betray it with a kiss!

In the coming election this cause has its representative in Abraham Lincoln. And why has he been selected? Not solely because he is a popular favorite in the great Northwest, — of blameless life, of unimpeachable integrity, of acknowledged abilities, and of practical talent, all of which are unquestionable recommendations, shared, however, by many others, — but because he had made himself the determined champion of the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, stating the case with knowledge, with moderation, and yet with firmness, — avowing openly his hatred of Slavery, — likening its introduction in the Territories now to the Canada thistle, which a few may plant to the detriment of succeeding generations, and then again to snakes deposited in the cradle of an infant, — and especially exposing the dishonest invention of "Squatter Sov-

creignty," which would despoil Congress of all power over this subject, and transfer it to the distant handful of first settlers.

On two different occasions his views have been put forth and developed, — first, in elaborate controversy with Mr. Douglas in Illinois, and, secondly, in his well-known speech at the Cooper Institute, New York. He does not need my praise; nor would I step aside from my argument to praise anybody; but I may fitly call attention to this masterly address, which, in careful research, clearness of statement, and directness of purpose, may well compare with any one of the innumerable speeches ever made concerning the power of Congress over the Territories. On the topic it professes to treat it is a monograph. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the effort was needed in establishing his title to that public confidence which made him our candidate. It is for the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories that he has labored, and, excepting his brief, but honorable, experience in Congress, his public life may be summed up in this single service, — nor more nor less. The magnitude of the service may be measured by his present position as representative of our cause.

Arrayed in opposition are three other candidates for the Presidency, — Bell, Breckinridge, and Douglas, — I mention them in alphabetical order, — differing superficially among themselves, but all concurring in friendship for Slavery and in withstanding its prohibition anywhere, with followers ready, in warfare against the Republican party, to coalesce or fuse with each other. In this readiness you see the common antagonism. No person in the Republican party can think of coalition

or fusion with either of these three parties; for they each and all represent in some form resistance to the Prohibition of Slavery, and therefore must be opposed, each and all. The whole trio are no better than Mrs. Malaprop's idea of Cerberus, "three gentlemen at once," and must be encountered together.

Looking at them separately, there is, first, the Bell party. Pardon me, if I use names familiarly: it is but for the sake of convenience. This party, known among us only by its boasts, draws its practical support from the Slave States. It is a Proslavery party, — essentially hostile to the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, and dealing always in treacherous generalities, which, if they have any meaning, mean Slavery, — exalting the Constitution, as Slave-Masters understand it, — also exalting the Union, in order to gain credit for "saving" it, — and calling for the enforcement of the laws, meaning the enforcement of the only Act of Congress which Slave-Masters specially recognize, that for the surrender of fugitive slaves. Your indulgence would hardly excuse me, if I occupied time in argument against this combination, which, without declaring a single principle, without any chance of a majority in the electoral colleges, and without any hope of a single electoral vote in the Free States, runs for luck, — which, with only a single possible vote in the House of Representatives, where it seeks, for a revolutionary purpose, to transfer the election, again proposes to run for luck.

Its plan, so far as known, is this. You will remember, that, by the Constitution of the United States, in the event of failure to elect by the people, the House

of Representatives is empowered to choose a President out of the three highest candidates for that office, and the Senate to choose a Vice-President out of the two highest candidates for that office. Now, assuming, first, that the Republican candidate will not be elected by the people, which you know to be a very wild assumption, — and, secondly, assuming that there will be no election of President by the House, — this party, turning next to the Vice-Presidency, assumes, thirdly, that Mr. Everett will be one of the two highest candidates for the Vice-Presidency, and, fourthly, that Mr. Everett will be elected by the Senate Vice-President, and then will become President, like John Tyler and Millard Fillmore, — not through the death of a President, but through a double failure by the people and by the House. Such is the calculation by which this band of professed Conservatives seek repose for the country. Permit me to say that it is equalled only by the extravagance of Mrs. Toodles, in the farce. Her passion was auctions, where she purchased ancient articles of furniture under the idea that they might some day be useful. Once, to the amazement of her husband, she brought home a brass door-plate with the name of Thompson spelled with a p. "But what is this for?" he demanded. "Why," said Mrs. Toodles, with logic worthy of the Bell party, "though we have been married many years without children, it is possible, my dear, that we may have a child, that child may be a daughter, and may live to the age of maturity, and she *may* marry a man of the name of Thompson spelled with a p. Then how handy it will be to have this door-plate in the house!" I doubt if any person really familiar with affairs can consider this nomination for

the Vice-Presidency of more practical value than Mrs. Toodles's brass door-plate, with the name of Thompson spelled with a p, picked up at an auction. But then, in a certain most difficult contingency at the end of a long line of contingencies, how handy it must be to have it in the house!

In speaking of the Breckinridge party, I confess myself at the outset perplexed between abhorrence of its dogma and respect for its frankness. No plausible generality is put forward, as by the Bell party, under which good and evil may alike find shelter; nor is any plausible invention announced, as in the case of yet another party, under which the real issue is avoided. But the insufferable claim, first made by Mr. Calhoun, is unequivocally promulgated, that under the Constitution the master may at all times carry his slaves into the Territories, and neither Congress nor Territorial Legislature can prohibit the outrage. This at least is plain. There is something even in criminal boldness which we are disposed to admire. We like an open foe, who scorns to hide in deceit, and meets us in daylight. But we do not like a foe who dodges and hides so that we cannot find him. Nor do we like a man who gives us only something counterfeit in exchange for our votes. We do not like the double-faced prevaricator, who cozens both sides, and deals in words "that palter in a double sense." It is praise to be frank, even on a bad side; and I have no reason to question this merit of the Breckinridge party. And yet this very frankness reveals an insensibility to reason and humanity, which, when recognized, must add to our abhorrence. That men calling themselves Christians,

calling themselves Americans, in this nineteenth century, should without a blush assert such a dogma may well excite our wonder.

Fully to appreciate this dogma, you must know and feel what Slavery is. And here I content myself simply with reminding you of what elsewhere I have demonstrated, that Slavery, as defined by existing law, is a *five-headed* Barbarism, composed of five different wrongs, each of which you must indignantly reject: first, the impudent claim of property in man; secondly, the gross mockery of the marriage-tie; thirdly, the absolute nullification of the parental relation; fourthly, the denial of instruction; and, fifthly, the robbery of another's labor, and of all its fruits: that this whole five-headed Barbarism, sustained by existing law, and enforced by the lash, is simply *to compel labor without wages;* and that to this end all great rights of freedom, marriage, family, instruction, and property are trampled down. This is Slavery. Turn it over, look at it as you will, such it is, and such it must be seen to be by every honest mind.

> "To those who know thee not no words can paint,
> And those who know thee know all words are faint."

Believe me, fellow-citizens, I do not present this outline willingly. Gladly would I drop a veil over the revolting features. But when audacious claims are made for Slavery, and you are told by one candidate that it travels with the Constitution into new Territories, and then by another candidate that the handful of first settlers can alone deal with it in the Territories, while Congress sits powerless, it becomes your duty to consider precisely what Slavery is, to study it in the law from which it derives its character, and to

follow it also in all its effects. Here is the essential and vital part of the argument, even on the question of Constitutional Law. It is only when this is done that we can see how irrational is every effort to give it constitutional force, or to save it from the action of Congress within the national jurisdiction.

According to the claim now made, Slavery exists under the Constitution everywhere outside the States,— in other words, Slavery is National; whereas just the contrary is true. Everywhere outside the States Freedom must prevail; in other words, Freedom is National. Yes, Freedom is National, and Slavery Sectional. Read the Constitution, and tell me if it be not so. Surely, if a pretension so peculiar as that now set up could be found there, it would be plain to all, so that no man could question it. Like the Decalogue, it would be in positive language: "Thou shalt enslave thy brother man." It would be left to no doubtful phrase or ambiguous words, but would stand forth in appalling certainty, a "darkness visible." It would be stuck up, like Gessler's hat in the marketplace, so that all could see it. But nothing is clearer than that in this well-considered instrument there is not one clause or word which maintains property in man, not one clause or word on which any such pretension can be founded. Wherever there is any imagined reference to slaves, it is at most only to their possible existence in States, "under the laws thereof"; and then their designation as "persons" shows, that, whatever may be their condition in the States, the Constitution does not regard them as "property." Thank God, the Constitution does not contain the idea that man can be the property of man. It was the declared

purpose of Mr. Madison to exclude this idea. So completely has this been done, that it is among boasts often made, that a stranger in a distant country or a future age, reading our Constitution, and having no other record of our history, would not know that any human being had ever been claimed as "property" within the limits of the Republic. The text, at least, of the Constitution is blameless. If men find Slavery there, it is only because they make the Constitution reflect their own souls.

And yet this pretension is now the shibboleth of a great political party; this is its single inspiration; this is its only principle; this is all its stock in trade; this is its very "breath of life." To this base use has Democracy come. In voting for Mr. Breckinridge, you declare, first, that man can have property in his fellow-man, and, secondly, that such property is recognized by the Constitution of the United States. The soul recoils from both. But even if the first be true, — which I utterly deny, — it does not follow that such property is sanctioned in the Constitution.

Last in order of alphabet is the Douglas party, whose single cry is "Popular Sovereignty"; last also in character, — for who can respect what we know to be a deceit? The statesman founds himself on principles; sometimes it is his office to frame expedients; but Popular Sovereignty, as now put forward, is not a principle, — oh, no! not even an expedient; it is nothing but a device, a pretext, an evasion, a dodge, a trick, in order to avoid the commanding question, whether Slavery shall be prohibited in the Territories. That is all.

All hail to Popular Sovereignty in its true glory! This is the grand principle, first announced in the Declaration of Independence, which is destined to regenerate the world. It is embodied in those famous words, adopted by the Republican Convention at Chicago, that among the unalienable rights of all men are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" These are sacred words, full of life-giving energy. Not simply national independence was here proclaimed, but also the primal rights of all mankind. Then and there appeared the Angel of Human Liberation, speaking and acting at once with heaven-born strength, — breaking bolts, unloosing bonds, and opening prison-doors, — always ranging on its mighty errand, wherever there are any, no matter of what country or race, who struggle for rights denied, — now cheering Garibaldi at Naples, as it had cheered Washington in the snows of Valley Forge, — and especially visiting all who are down-trodden, whispering that there is none so poor as to be without rights which every man is bound to respect.

> "The affrighted gods confessed their awful lord;
> *They dropped the fetters*, trembled, and adored." [1]

None so degraded as to be beneath its beneficent reach, none so lofty as to be above its restraining power; while before it Despotism and Oligarchy fall on their faces, like the image of Dagon, and the people everywhere begin to govern themselves. Such is the Popular Sovereignty proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence.

[1] Iliad, tr. Pope, Book I. 528, 529 [406].

But the Great Declaration, not content with announcing certain rights as unalienable, and therefore beyond the control of any government, still further, restrains the sovereignty, which it asserts, by simply declaring that the United States have "full power to do all acts and things which independent states may OF RIGHT do." Here is a well-defined limitation upon Popular Sovereignty. The dogma of Tory lawyers and pamphleteers — put forward to sustain the claim of Parliamentary omnipotence, and vehemently espoused by Dr. Johnson in his "Taxation no Tyranny" — was, openly, that *sovereignty* is in its nature *illimitable*, precisely as is now loosely professed by Mr. Douglas for his handful of squatters. But this dogma is distinctly discarded in the Declaration, and it is frankly proclaimed that all *sovereignty* is subordinate to the rule of *Right*. Mark, now, the difference. All existing governments at that time, even the local governments of the Colonies, stood on *Power*, without limitation. Here was a new government, which, taking its place among the nations, announced that it stood only on *Right*, and claimed no sovereignty inconsistent with *Right*. Such, again, is the Popular Sovereignty of the Declaration of Independence.

And yet this transcendent principle is now degraded into a "dodge," and the sacred name of Popular Sovereignty is prostituted to cover the claim of a master over his slave. It is urged that a handful of squatters may rightfully decide this claim, and the time-honored traditional power of Congress over Slavery in the Territories is denied or voted down. To protect this "villany," as John Wesley would call it, the right of the people to govern themselves is invoked, — forgetful that

this divine right can give no authority to enslave others, that even the people are not omnipotent, and that never do they rise so high as when, recognizing the everlasting laws of Right, they bend to the behests of Justice.

Though bearing the name of Mr. Douglas, and now peddled through the country by him, this contrivance is not of his invention. It comes from an older head. It first showed itself in the Nicholson Letter of 1847, by which General Cass, as Presidential candidate, sought to avoid the Wilmot Proviso. Laborious, studious, exemplary in private life, and fertile in pretexts, this venerable character has afforded the formula by which men have voted for Slavery, while making professions for Freedom. He is author of the artifice — rejected by every Slave-Master, and rejected by every lover of Freedom, whose eyes are open — which, under the nickname of Squatter Sovereignty, has been the device of doughfaces, enabling them sometimes to deceive the public and sometimes even to deceive themselves. Owing to the peculiar condition of opinion at that time, not yet stiffened against the compromise of Human Rights, his very vacillation put him in harmony with the public, and gave him a commanding position. Once for the Wilmot Proviso, which asserted the power of Congress over the Territories, and then for a pretended Popular Sovereignty, which denied this power, he became the pendulum between Freedom and Slavery, and, thus swinging, imparted motion to a sham Democracy.

The device next showed itself on the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska Bill; and here it became a trick, as appears by open confession of one of the parties

to it, — and a trick it has continued ever since. It was proposed to repeal the old Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, established as part of the Missouri Compromise. But instead of doing this openly and precisely, by simple words of repeal, language was invented to mystify the whole question. Then appeared that "little stump speech injected in the belly of the bill," according to Colonel Benton, declaring that the intent was to leave the people "perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." As in the gray of the morning the fatal bill containing these words passed, General Cass, rising from his seat, — I remember well the scene, — exclaimed, "This is the triumph of Squatter Sovereignty!" The old Prohibition of Slavery was overthrown, and his Nicholson Letter was vindicated.

And now note well the trick. The Slave-Masters who voted for these words rejected with scorn the idea that the handful of squatters could exclude Slavery. According to them, Slavery went with the Constitution, and was beyond the control of squatters. But formal assertion of this dogma would have caused trouble, and it was accordingly disguised in these familiar words, — "subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, in a recent speech, lets us behind the scenes. He tells, that, at a caucus of Senators, "both wings of the Democracy agreed that each should maintain its particular theory before the public, — one side sustaining Squatter Sovereignty, and the other Protection to Slavery in the Territories, but pledging themselves to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court, whatever it might be." Such was

the secret conspiracy, concealed for a long time from the public, and only recently revealed. And Mr. Douglas was a party to it.

Had the Popular Sovereignty of Mr. Douglas been a reality and not a sham, had it been a sincere recognition of popular rights instead of a trick to avoid their recognition, he could not have been party to such deception. But how was the fact? While professing Popular Sovereignty, what did his bill really confer upon the people? Not the right to organize their own government, determining for themselves its form and character; for all this was done by Act of Congress. Not the right to choose the Executive; for the Governor and all other officers in this department were sent from Washington, nominated by the President. Not the right to nominate the Judiciary; for the judges were also sent from Washington, nominated by the President. Not even the right completely to constitute the Legislature; for even this body was placed in many important respects beyond the popular control. Thus in each of the three great departments of State, Executive, Judicial, and Legislative, is Popular Sovereignty disowned.

Search the "Congressional Globe" during the Nebraska debate, and you will see with what sincerity Mr. Douglas guarded the much vaunted rights of the people. Mr. Chase moved to allow the people to elect their Governor and other officers. On the vote by ayes and noes, the champion of Popular Sovereignty voted *No.* Mr. Chase, whose effort to unmask this hypocrisy was indefatigable, made another motion, which put Mr. Douglas still more to the test. After the words of alleged Popular Sovereignty in the bill, he moved to add,

"under which the people of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery therein." Here was a plain proposition. On the vote by ayes and noes, Mr. Douglas and his associates again voted *No.* His recent excuse, put forth in his single peripatetic speech, is, that the proposition was not in the alternate, — that is, that it gave power only to exclude, and not to admit. But if he really favored it in that form, why not move to amend it by adding the power to admit, instead of voting against the whole proposition? It is clear that such an open and unequivocal declaration was not congenial with the game to be played.

The bill passed, and then came other opportunities to test the sincerity of the present knight-errant of Popular Sovereignty. Under its provisions commenced at once a race of emigration into the new Territories, and there Free Labor and Slave Labor grappled. Lovers of Freedom from the North were encountered by partisans of Slavery from the South, organized by Blue Lodges in Missouri, and incited from every part of the Land of Slavery. The officials of a government established under pretended safeguards of Popular Sovereignty all ranged themselves on the side of Slavery; or, if their allegiance became doubtful, — as in the case of Governor Reeder, — they were dismissed, and more available tools sent instead. I spare details. You cannot forget that winter and spring preceding the Presidential election of 1856, when we were alternately startled and stunned at tidings from Kansas, as a body of strangers from Missouri, entering in hundreds, forcibly seized the polls, and, under pretended forms of law, set up a Usurpation, which by positive legislation pro-

ceeded to establish Slavery there, and to surround it with a Code of Death. The atrocity of Philip the Second, when, by violence and through a "Council of Blood," he sought to fasten the Inquisition upon Holland, was renewed. Invasion, rapine, outrage, arson, rape, murder, the scalping-knife, were the agents now employed; and to crown this prostration of popular rights, Lawrence, home of New England settlers, and microcosm of New England life, was burned to the ground by a company of profane and drunken ruffians stimulated from Washington.

What then was the course of the champion of Popular Sovereignty? Did he thunder and lighten? Did he come forward to defend those settlers, who had gone to Kansas under pretended safeguards of his bill? Oh, no! In the Senate he openly ranged himself on the side of their oppressors, mocked at their calamities, denounced them as "insurgents," insulted their agents, and told them they must submit, — while the distant Emigrant Aid Society in Massachusetts was made the butt of his most opprobrious assaults. All this I myself witnessed.

Then came another scene, with which, owing to my enforced absence from the Senate, as an invalid, I have less personal familiarity; but it is known to all of you. The Senatorial election in Illinois was at hand, when Mr. Douglas suddenly discovered that Popular Sovereignty was something more than a name. He opposed the Lecompton Constitution; but my distinguished colleague [Mr. WILSON] will tell you that even there he was kept from barefaced apostasy only by the stern will and indomitable principle of the lamented Broderick, the murdered Senator from California.

Then came stump speeches and Senate speeches without number, and a magazine article, all to explain Popular Sovereignty. But this simple principle, which, in the light of the Declaration of Independence, and also in the light of reason, is plain enough, has been so twisted, turned, and befogged, now explained away and then explained back, now enlarged and then limited, now acknowledged and then denied, that I challenge any person to say with certainty in what, according to Mr. Douglas, it really consists.

At one time we find him declaring that "Slavery is the creature of local law, and not of the Constitution of the United States." Good! Let him follow this to its natural conclusion, and no Republican asks more.

Then, at New Orleans, after his election to the Senate was secured, he says: "The Democracy of Illinois accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott as an authoritative interpretation of the Constitution. In accordance with that decision, we hold that slaves are property, and hence on an equality with all other kinds of property, and that the owner of a slave has the same right to move into a Territory and carry his slave property with him as the owner of any other property has to go there and carry his property." Here is the extreme dogma of Slavery in full feather. Let him follow this to its natural conclusion, and no Breckinridge man could ask more.

At another time we find him declaring that "sovereign States have the right to make their own constitutions and establish their own governments, but that he has never claimed these powers for the Territories, nor has he ever failed to resist such claims, when set up by

others." How, then, under this theory, can Popular Sovereignty have any foothold in the Territories? It is clear that all Territorial legislation against Slavery must be invalid.

And then again, in another place, by roundabout language, he admits, that, according to the Dred Scott decision, which he declares that he "approves," the people of a Territory cannot, by any legislation, confiscate slave property, or impair the "Constitutional right" of the master to this property in the Territory. With this limitation, pray, where, again, is Popular Sovereignty?

But elsewhere, as if to furnish something for the other side, he intimates a policy of inaction by the Territorial Legislature with regard to Slavery, and asks, "Would not the *inaction* of the local Legislature, its refusal to provide a *Slave Code,* or to punish offences against that species of property, exclude Slavery just as effectually as a Constitutional prohibition?" And here is an end of the matter.

Changing forms as often as Proteus, we yet find him admitting, first, that Slavery goes into the Territories under the Constitution; secondly, that the right of property in a slave cannot be destroyed by the Territorial Legislature; and all that this Legislature can do, by way of opposition, is to fold its hands and to seal its tongue in inaction. What, then, is this wonderful doctrine? So far as it means anything, it is simply this: that the people of a Territory have a right to *introduce* Slavery, but not to *prohibit* it. And such is Popular Sovereignty! Verily, between this and the Breckinridge dogma there is about the same difference as between the much-vexed doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, where there was only

the difference of a single syllable, and both involved the same thing.

Nor is even this all. The Convention at Baltimore which nominated Mr. Douglas has declared by formal resolution, that "the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been or shall hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens, and *enforced with promptness and fidelity by every branch of the General Government.*" And Mr. Douglas, in accepting his nomination, has expressly recognized this doctrine, thus in advance delivering over his bantling Popular Sovereignty to the tender mercies of the Supreme Court.

Far different is the position of Mr. Lincoln, who has openly said, in his debate with Mr. Douglas, "If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether Slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. That is what I would do."[1] And allow me to add, that this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln is the doctrine of the Republican party. Any doctrine short of this betrays the trick of Mr. Douglas.

The tree is known by its fruits, and if anything further were needed to expose this cheat of Popular Sovereignty, it might be found in its fruits as boasted by Mr. Douglas. A slave code most revolting in character had been adopted by the Territorial Legislature of New Mexico, not only establishing Slavery

[1] Speech at Chicago, July 10, 1858: Political Debates between Hon. Abraham Lincoln and Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, p. 20.

there, including the serfdom of whites, but prohibiting Emancipation. Through the generous activity of the Republicans, and in the exercise of a just Congressional intervention, a bill passed the House of Representatives annulling this slave code. While the bill was on the table of the Senate, attesting at once the disposition of the House of Representatives to interfere against Slavery, and also the signal necessity of such interference, Mr. Douglas took occasion to make his boasts. Surrounded by the chiefs of Proslavery Democracy, the juggler of Popular Sovereignty thus showed what the trick had done for Slavery. Here are his words: —

"It is part of the history of the country, that, under this doctrine of Non-Intervention, this doctrine that you delight to call Squatter Sovereignty, the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected Slavery in the whole of that Territory. *Under this doctrine, they have converted a tract of Free Territory into Slave Territory more than five times the size of the State of New York.* Under this doctrine, *Slavery has been extended from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of California,* and from the line of the Republic of Mexico, not only up to 36° 30′, but up to 38°, *giving you a degree and a half more Slave Territory than you ever claimed.*"[1]

As the tree is known by its fruits, so also is the man known by the company he keeps. At first associated with Mr. Douglas on the same ticket, as candidate for the Vice-Presidency, was Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Alabama, belonging to the school of Slave Propagandists, and fresh from voting in the Senate against Popular Sovereignty; and when he declined, his place was supplied

[1] Speech in the Senate, May 16, 1860: Congressional Globe, 36th Cong. 1st Sess., Appendix, p. 314.

by Mr. Johnson, of Georgia, also belonging to the school of Slave Propagandists, who from the beginning has denounced Popular Sovereignty, and insisted that "it is the right of the South to demand, and the duty of Congress to extend, protection to Slavery in the Territories during the Territorial state," and who, at Philadelphia, in a public speech, did not hesitate to insult the mechanics and working-men of the country by the insolent declaration that "Capital should own Labor." Such is the associate of Mr. Douglas, with whom he is so united as candidate that you cannot vote for one without voting for the other. One of his earnest supporters in the Convention at Baltimore, Mr. Gaulden, of Georgia, pressed the opening of the slave-trade with Africa on the very grounds of Popular Sovereignty and Non-Intervention. After declaring, that, "if it be right to go to Virginia and buy a negro and pay two thousand dollars for him, it is equally right to go to Africa, where we can get them for fifty dollars," he said, that, "if the Southern men had the spunk and spirit to come right up and face the North, he believed the Northern Democracy, at least, would come to the true doctrine of Popular Sovereignty and Non-Intervention." This barbarous utterance was received by the Douglas Convention with "applause and laughter." Such are the men with whom this candidate is associated.

If you follow Mr. Douglas in his various speeches, you cannot fail to be shocked by the heartlessness of his language. Never in history has any public man insulted human nature so boldly. At the North he announces himself as "always for the white man against the nigger," but at the South he is "for the nigger

against the alligator." It was natural that such a man, who thus mocked at a portion of God's creation made in the Divine image, should say, "Vote Slavery up or vote it down," — as if the idea of voting it up were not impious and never to be endured. Beyond all doubt, no majority can be permitted to vote that fellow-men shall be bought and sold like cattle. The pretension is preposterous, aggravated by knowledge on his part that under his device the settlers could only vote Slavery up, and that they were not allowed to vote it down. But this speech attests a brazen insensibility to Human Rights. Not so spoke the Fathers of the Republic, who would not let us miss an opportunity to vote Slavery down. Not so spoke Washington, who declared that to the abolition of Slavery "his suffrage should never be wanting." Such is the whole political philosophy of this Presidential candidate. A man thus indifferent to the rights of a whole race is naturally indifferent to other things which make for justice and peace.

Again he cries out, that the Slavery agitation is in the way of public business, and that it must be removed from Congress. But who has thrust it there so incessantly as himself? Nay, who so largely as himself has been the occasion of its appearance? His complaint illustrates anew the old fable. It was the wolf above that troubled the waters, and not the lamb below. It is the Slave Propagandists — among whom the champion of Popular Sovereignty must find a place — who, from the Missouri Compromise in 1820, through all the different stages of discussion, down to the shutting out of Kansas as a Free State at the recent session, have rendered it impossible to avoid the

exciting subject. By dishonest, audacious theories of Slavery, both morally and constitutionally, they have aroused a natural opposition, and put all who truly love their country on the defensive. Yes, it is in defence of the Constitution perverted, of reason insulted, and of humanity disowned, that we are obliged to speak out.

True, the country needs repose; — but it is the repose of Liberty, and not the repose of Despotism. And, believe me, that glad day can never come, until the mad assumptions for Slavery are all rejected, and the Government is once more brought back to the spirit of the founders. It was clearly understood at the beginning that Congress could not touch Slavery in the States; and this is the doctrine of the Republican party now. But it was also clearly understood at the beginning that Slavery everywhere else was within the jurisdiction of Congress; and this also is the doctrine of the Republican party now. With the practical acceptance of these two correlative principles the Slavery Question will cease to agitate Congress and to divide political parties. Transferred to the more tranquil domain of morals, religion, economy, and philanthropy, it must continue to occupy the attention of the good and the humane; but it will cease to be the stumbling-block of politicians. Not until then is it permitted us to expect that Sabbath of repose so much longed for.

The first stage in securing for our country the repose which all covet will be the election of Abraham Lincoln as President, and the election of that well-tried,

faithful, and able Senator, — whom I know well, — Hannibal Hamlin, as Vice-President. I do not dwell on all that will then follow, — homesteads for actual settlers, improvement of rivers and harbors, economy and purity in the National Administration, increased means of communication, postal and commercial, with the establishment of a Pacific Railroad; nor do I dwell on the extirpation of the direful African slave-trade, now thriving anew under our national flag, — nor on our relations with foreign countries, destined to assume that character of moderation and firmness which becomes a great republic, neither menacing the weak nor stooping to the proud, and, while sympathizing with generous endeavors for Freedom everywhere, avoiding all complicity with schemes of lawless violence. Ask the eminent Boston merchant, Mr. Clark, whose avocation makes him know so well the conduct of our Government with Hayti, if there is not need of change in our course toward a humble people, in order to save ourselves from the charge of national meanness, if not of national injustice? But it is by this election that you will especially vindicate the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, even in the face of the Dred Scott decision, and fling your indignant answer at once at the Proslavery non-committalism of Bell, the Proslavery dogma of Breckinridge, and the Proslavery dodge of Douglas.

All this can be done, nay, will be done. But let me not beguile you. The ancient price of Liberty was vigilance; and this price has not diminished of late years, especially when surrounded by men accustomed to power and stimulated by rage. Already the news has reached us of combinations to consolidate the Opposi-

tion, — as we read that of old two inveterate parties among the Jews were reconciled. "The same day," writes the sacred historian, "Pilate and Herod were made friends together; for before they were at enmity between themselves." This example is too kindred not to be adopted. Already, also, we hear of devices at a distance, and even near at home, to distract our friends, by producing distrust either of our principles or of our candidate. At one time it is said that the principle of Prohibition is a mistake, — and then again, by natural consequence, that our candidate is not sufficiently moderate.

Fellow-citizens, hearken not to any of these things. Keep the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories as the fixed and irreversible purpose of your hearts, and insist that it shall be established by Congress; for without Congress it may not be established. Old Cato procured a decree of the Roman Senate that no king should ever enter Rome, saying that "a king is a carnivorous animal." A similar decree must be adopted by Congress against an animal more carnivorous than king. In upholding this paramount necessity, I utter nothing new. During the debate on the Nebraska Bill, my eminent colleague at that time in the Senate, Mr. Everett, now candidate for the Vice-Presidency, while approving the Prohibition, allowed himself to disparage its importance. With the convictions which are mine, I felt it my duty to reply, kindly, but most strenuously. After exhibiting the efficacy of the Prohibition, I said:—

"Surely this cannot be treated lightly. But I am unwilling to measure the exigency of the Prohibition by the number of persons, whether many or few, whom it may

protect. Human rights, whether in a multitude or the solitary individual, are entitled to equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit, the flag of our country only recently became the impenetrable panoply of a homeless wanderer who claimed its protection in a distant sea; and, in this spirit, I am constrained to declare that there is no place accessible to human avarice or human lust or human force, whether the lowest valley or the loftiest mountain-top, whether the broad flower-spangled prairies or the snowy caps of the Rocky Mountains, where the Prohibition of Slavery, like the Commandments of the Decalogue, should not go."[1]

And these words, uttered more than six years ago, are still of vital, practical force. The example of Delaware shows how little Slavery it takes to make a Slave State, giving two votes to the ascendency of the Slave Power in the Senate. Be wakeful, then, and do not disparage that enemy which for sixty years has ruled the Republic. "That man is dangerous," exclaimed the Athenian orator, "who does not see danger in Philip." And I now say, that man is dangerous who does not see danger in the Slave Power.

When God created man in his own image, and saw that his work was good, he did not destine his creature for endless ages to labor without wages, compelled by the lash. Such degradation we seek to arrest by careful measures under the Constitution. And this is the cause of which your candidate is the generous and noble representative. Stand by him. Let not fidelity to those principles which give dignity and glory to Massachusetts, and to our common country, be an argument against him. From the malignity of enemies, from the

[1] The Landmark of Freedom: *ante*, Vol. III. p. 291.

vacillation of timeservers, and from the weakness of friends shield him by your votes. Make him strong to commence the great work by which the Declaration of Independence shall become a living letter, and the ways of Providence shall be justified to men.

> "If yet ye are not lost to common sense,
> Assist your patriot in your own defence;
> That stupid cant, 'He went too far,' despise,
> And know that to be brave is to be wise." [1]

[1] Swift, To the Citizens, 30–33. These words were introduced to sustain not merely the speaker, but also John A. Andrew, who was about to be nominated Governor of Massachusetts, and against whom this very accusation had been made.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D MLD
JUN 10 1964
MAY 29 1964

APR 17 1968

INTERLIBRARY LOANS
APR 3 1968
SD State
TWO WEEKS ONLY
DATED RECEIPT
REC'D LD-URL
APR 29 1968
REC'D LD-URL

NOV 21 1968
REC'D LD-URL

LD MAY 11 '71
MAY 25 1971

REC'D LD-URL
APR
LD
URL
APR 26 1975

Form L9-75m-7,'61(C1437s4)444

UC Southern Regional Library Facility
A 000 268 380 3

E
415.6
S95
v.6